THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the July number of *The Hibbert Journal* the editor has a long and thoughtful article on 'Peace by Compulsion and Otherwise.' This is a subject which is of immediate and supreme consequence to the nations and of vital interest to the Christian Church. It must therefore receive the most assiduous attention of all thoughtful minds in Church and State.

Dr. Jacks, while not altogether pessimistic, can only see world-peace as a dim and far-off vision. He considers three possible ways in which it might become a reality. These are by Compulsion, by Agreement, or by Inadvertence, as he curiously names the last.

The way of compulsion is the one most likely to be tried in the immediate future. 'Compulsion having become the order of the day, the State an expert in the art of imposing it, and the citizens habituated to the imposition, it is not surprising that projects are in the air for extending the system to the keeping of peace between nations, as it claims to keep the peace at home under the guardianship of police.'

Rule by compulsion is not necessarily anti-Christian for force is morally neutral and may be used at the impulse of righteousness and love. St. Paul gave thanks for the settled order imposed upon the nations of his day by the military power of Rome, and in general settled government is a handmaid to the propagation of the gospel.

But the gravest difficulties can be foreseen. Peace by compulsion cannot be a permanent or an ideal settlement of world affairs, for it implies the dominance of some nations and the subjection of others. This is a state of things which must sooner or later prove unendurable. To keep a nation 'totally and permanently disarmed,' as many propose that Germany should be, is really an impossible task. A nation is not totally disarmed so long as it has strength of muscle and manly spirit and a will to fight. But more especially 'the economic structure and entire mechanical equipment of an industrial nation, apparently designed for the service of peace, can be rapidly mobilized for the service of war and become an enormous arsenal or armament factory.' Could human vigilance maintain a preventive watch against that for years and it might be for generations?

On the other hand, the dominating power becomes itself a fearful menace to the peace of the world. Its nature and strength are sometimes disguised under the name of an 'International Police,' but that name is completely misleading if it carries any suggestion of the peaceful policeman quietly controlling the traffic at the cross-roads by a simple wave of the hand. The grim reality would be vastly different. The task of keeping world peace 'could be undertaken only by a force of warriors, of fighting men, trained for battle, armed with the deadliest of weapons, quick on the trigger, inured to campaigning and expert in tactical and strategical operations; in other words, by an army ready for war and equipped with every modern device for waging it by sea, land, and air.' An unarmed world would lie at its feet, and the question arises *Quis custodes custodiet?* What a temptation it would offer to the ambitious and the clever unscrupulous who have an uncanny power of getting hold of the reins of government! 'As wolves watch the sheepfold, so these will watch our peace-keeping armament, our "International Police," and be quick to seize it, on opportunity given, for their own ends, having done their best in the meantime to corrupt the policemen by the Black Art of propaganda, which is the Fine Art of scoundrels, and so prepare the ground.' The fact is, the armed man is infinitely more dangerous than in any previous time, more to be feared, less to be trusted.

Is there, then, any better hope of world peace by common consent? Dr. Jacks, while very dubious about governments, is confident that were 'a plebiscite taken of the whole human race, now suffering under the rule of scoundrels in many lands, Peace by Consent would be carried by a majority so overwhelming that the greatest majority by which a scoundrel was ever elected

to power would be left a figure of no significance.' He is also confident that the common man, 'honest fellow as he is by nature,' having once pledged himself, would be true to his pledge. This is surely putting great faith in the common man who, when his personal interests are threatened, is as apt to scrap agreements and dishonour his pledged word as any government.

But even if such a plebiscite could be carried through and a universal vote for world peace obtained, what hope would there be of permanence so long as the vast inequalities between the nations — political, educational, economic — persist? The backward nations form the great majority of mankind. Would the advanced nations be content to submit the vital questions of world peace to a majority vote? On the other hand, would these backward races, whose economic conditions are unspeakably worse than ours, remain content with the *status quo*, or if their just demands were refused, as too often they are, would they patiently endure in the broad interest of world peace? It is obvious that, before there can be world peace by intelligent consent, there is a vast deal of educational work to be done, and of social and economic levelling up.

There remains a third way by which world peace might come, namely by what Dr. JACKS curiously calls 'Inadvertence.' By this he means that peace, like happiness, may best be sought and found as a by-product; that some new spirit might enter into men, the inspiration of some high ideal, the impulse of some noble passion, so that while not directly aiming at world peace the nations might be lifted on to a plane where world peace would be one of the natural fruits of their spirit. It is a captivating dream, of 'the emergence of some commanding aim, of an overarching purpose that would capture the imagination of the multitudes, drown their quarrels, override their disputes, make them ashamed of their former petty-mindedness and carry them forward on a tidal wave of magnanimous resolve to an end worth attaining by man. This may be too much to hope for and certainly is too much to count upon. But the like has happened before and will happen again, though none can predict the times and the seasons nor tell from what quarter the trumpet will sound.'

It need hardly be pointed out that all this is manifestly in the line of Christian thinking and of Christian hope. A great spiritual change in men is needed, of the nature of conversion. Disarmaments, treaties, Atlantic Charters, however necessary and helpful, cannot attain the end because they can never produce the spiritual climate. '"Security from want and fear," is more, no doubt, than the bleating of a sheep, but less than the call of a trumpet: it will not serve the purpose. It is a negative good, making no appeal to what is highest in man and liberating no expulsive power.'

The practical conclusion for the Church and for Christian people is that above all else the gospel needs to be preached to the nations of the world, for in it, as nowhere else, is the expulsive and impulsive power that can lead to world peace. This does not mean the coming of the millennium. World peace may be attained far short of that. For even now there are many ordinary Christian folk in the world who, without professing to be perfect saints, are yet fully resolved to live at peace with their fellow-men and to submit every dispute to just arbitrament. If the number of such Christian people could be sensibly multiplied among the nations, surely no impossible task, the great desideratum of world peace would be brought within sight.

It is a welcome sign that a Roman Catholic scholar can offer with the imprimatur of his Church a critical study in the theories of Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann—*Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*, by the Rev. Laurence J. MCGINLEY, S.J.[1] Though he takes his stand on the historical validity of the Gospels, his work is in great part an exposition of the views of those 'rationalist' critics.

The scope and plan of the work is as follows. Only the theories of the two admitted leaders of the movement of Form-Criticism are set forth in detail. Only their treatment of the Synoptic Gospels is expounded and considered; and there, only a portion of the Synoptic material. Choice has been made of the miracles of healing both because of their special suitability for form-analysis and because of their intrinsic importance for the Catholic apologist and exegete.

Accordingly, the work begins with an introductory chapter on the Principles of Form-Criticism. Then come chapters on Paradigm and Apothegm, Novelle and Miracle-Story, in which the application of the method of Form-Criticism to the narrative portions, and particularly the healing stories, is considered. The fourth chapter deals with the Synoptic Healing Narrative in the light of the argument from analogy so much used by

[1] Woodstock College Press, Woodstock, Maryland; $2.75.

the form-critics. It is followed by chapters on Rabbinic Analogies and Hellenic Analogies, and by a final chapter on the Typical Healing Narrative, in which the results of the investigation are stated.

Father McGinley brings to his task an acute mind, an incisive style, and an ample equipment of scholarship and learning. He is in close touch with the literature of his subject in German, French, and English. (We notice that in the very satisfying Bibliography he has included some recent articles from The Expository Times.) It is a very readable and informative work, and is couched in popular language; yet we must observe its settled propensity for 'prescind'!

After setting forth Form-Criticism in the broad outlines of its general theory our author offers the following objections to it. It neglects historical testimony (Papias, Irenæus, etc.) as to the origin of the Gospels. It fails to make allowance for the time required for a tradition to evolve as the Synoptic tradition is represented as doing. It does not give us a better knowledge of Jesus of Nazareth; indeed, in Bultmann's case at least, it leads to utterly negative results.

Comparing the apothegm of Bultmann with the paradigm of Dibelius (by which categories, more or less parallel, they respectively designate certain brief narrative portions of tradition), our author lays stress on the differences between the two critics. Despite their agreement in form-analysis their deductions from form to *Sitz im Leben* (social situation) result in very different conclusions. For Dibelius, the narrative portions under review have their origin in the preaching of the Hellenistic communities. For Bultmann, they spring from the debates of the community in Palestine. Perhaps, after all, the incidents simply happened as they have been recorded!

As for the Novellen and Miracle-Stories (by which categories, also more or less parallel, Dibelius and Bultmann respectively designate certain healing narratives of tradition), our author complains once again of the quite negative results produced by Form-Criticism. As against Dibelius' view that some of the Novellen were developed by expansion of the paradigm, he holds it was impossible in the first two decades of Christianity for extraneous motifs and foreign material to penetrate the tradition in the manner Dibelius suggests. As for Bultmann's handling of the Miracle-Stories, he cannot but regard it as vitiated by the rationalist presupposition that all pertaining to the supernatural must be rejected. In so far as Bultmann depends upon this presupposition he has ceased to be a literary critic or even an historian evaluating sources.

Coming now to his special contribution to the literature of Form-Criticism, Father McGinley examines the use Dibelius and Bultmann make of analogies drawn from other sources in confirmation of their conclusions with regard to the Synoptic Healing Narrative. In selecting this major argument of Form-Criticism for minute analysis and investigation he feels he has chosen a suitable test of the value of the method in general and its application to narratives of miraculous healings in particular. The question he puts is: 'Do the Gospel healing stories so resemble their rabbinic and Hellenic parallels in content, style, and topic, that they must have originated and developed in a similar way and in a similar atmosphere?'

Undoubtedly a most relevant question; and we cannot but admire the patience as well as the acumen our author displays in seeking to answer it. He is very conscious that in the course of the work of Synoptic analysis to which the question leads 'the modest spirituality of every miracle, the simple earnestness of every narrative, the light and warmth and inspiration of every word and deed of the Holy One of God, are necessarily lost to sight.' But he rightly emphasizes the importance of this 'dissecting work,' this 'mole-like burrowing,' if we are to discover the reasons why the miracles of the Synoptic tradition make a totally different impression upon us than the stories from the rabbinic and Hellenic literatures.

We must be content to conclude this Note by simply stating our author's main results. He maintains that traits common to all three traditions are only those due to the choice of subject matter and the unity of human nature. That the Jewish and Greek converts to the primitive Christian community did not introduce into the Synoptic tradition the motifs of their own traditions is seen from the difference in historical and spiritual tone between the Gospel narratives and the rabbinic and Hellenic parallels. And the reason of that difference is that the Synoptic tradition did not originate or develop in the same fashion as the rabbinic or Hellenic literature.

'It was not a compilation of popular anecdotes, evolving over a long period of time, careless of the reality of its facts. It was a threefold historico-apologetic composition, written by definite authors, in a hierarchical community, at a time when wit-

nesses of the events were still alive and aflame with zeal to propagate or annihilate the new religion.' So that the argument from analogy, thus tested according to form-critical methods, shows the falsity of Form-Criticism's general conclusions.

The Broadcast Addresses, published with the title *Man's Dilemma and God's Answer*,[1] have a Preface by the Rev. Dr. WELCH, Director of Religious Broadcasting, on 'What is the Gospel?' He begins with a statement with which, he says, many will violently disagree and with which, he hopes, none of us will agree easily. The statement is that only the Christian gospel faces the whole truth about human nature. And he adds to this eight words in italics: the gospel faces the truth about man, about human nature, *in the light of the truth about God.*

Those who 'violently disagree' will say at once: 'Nonsense! Why, the obvious thing about Christianity is that it won't face facts. Look at this war; think of Poland, Russia, Greece, concentration camps, the agony and suffering of the world—and you talk of a God of love! Then you preach the Sermon on the Mount!' Yes, says Dr. WELCH, but remember, what I said was that the gospel faces the *whole* truth about man. Only a Christian dare face the whole meaning of what is happening to-day. Only the gospel, and nothing and no one else in the world.

'I said the gospel faces the truth. I didn't say Christians do. I didn't even say the Church does. And yet most of us don't even know what the gospel is. Half the people in this country seem to think the gospel is the Sermon on the Mount. Many people think it is all the teaching of Christ put together. Some think it is the miracles or the parables. But it is none of these things. What is it? Well, to answer that I am going to put three questions, for it isn't getting the right answers that matters so much as asking the right questions.' But before he puts his questions Dr. WELCH wants us to engage with him in a little wholesome destruction.

What he wants to destroy is the sentimentalism that has afflicted our religious thought. He gives as an obvious instance the stained-glass idea of Christ in greens and reds, representing Jesus as 'a very nice, placid English gentleman in a white nightshirt and with lovely golden hair parted in the middle.' This kind of thing is a breach of both the Second and Third Commandments. It is making to ourselves false graven images. But that is only an example of something more subtle. What we have to do is to destroy wrong ideas of God, wrong mental images.

Many of us are shockingly sentimental about our religion. God's love is not to us, as it ought to be, a flame of fire. It is just pity. And it is this false sentimental picture of God which makes people ask why there can be so much suffering in the world. Dr. WELCH quotes from a letter which he recently received: 'If you were God and had taken the trouble to go through all that humiliation and suffering to redeem the world, wouldn't you be a bit hurt to find that, two thousand years after, people were still saying they didn't think there could be a God, or He wouldn't allow nasty things to happen, and bleating that they couldn't understand why God permitted the suffering of the innocent? If they don't understand by this time, they ought to. Christians are the only people who have no atom of excuse for not understanding.' And Dr. WELCH adds: 'Because, in the last resort, Christianity is both the explanation and the justification of suffering.'

Dr. WELCH goes on to develop this theme. Sentimentalism, he thinks, is far and away the greatest enemy of Christianity to-day. It is the insidious enemy within our camp, sapping our strength, blindfolding us to the truth, making us look on religion as nice feelings. It has saturated the Christian churches through and through. And it is a deadly enemy because it doesn't face the depth and tragedy of life. For about eighty per cent. of people to-day the words *God, sin,* and *forgiveness* are nearly meaningless. And how is one to preach the gospel if these three words are empty of meaning? They have been bled white by sentimentalism and superficiality.

Dr. WELCH quotes again from an anonymous colleague: 'The language of Christian faith and worship belongs to the other side of frustration and impotence: but most people have never really felt utterly frustrated and impotent. The language of the Prayer Book assumes that man has discovered himself to be in a quite hopeless case; that he is a miserable sinner (that is deserving of mercy or pity). Most people, most clergy, have never really discovered themselves to be such. It is a language of high tragedy and we insist on treating life as high comedy.'

Cauterize this sentimentalism, then; become realists; face facts. And when we do this, we

[1] S.C.M.; 6s. net.

are ready for the three questions that are to be put before us. The first is this: Is it, or is it not, true that every human effort carries within itself the seeds of its own decay, frustration, defeat, and death? If it is true, then such language as Henley's—'I am the master of my fate: I am the captain of my soul,' is grotesquely untrue, and all the exhortation to live our own life, to call our souls our own, to be self-sufficient, is absurd.

Take an illustration. At the end of the last war we were joyfully hopeful about the League of Nations. We believed the new and better world was just round the corner. And we know the sequel—compromise, evasion, selfishness, unemployment, misery, and war. But, of course, we know better now. We have learned from the League's mistakes. Have we? Is it not abundantly obvious that if we think we can create a new and better world by a new and better piece of political machinery we are living in a cloud cuckoo-land.

Take another illustration. It is a fact that great wars are becoming more frequent. It is a fact that wars are becoming more terrible. Comparative peace from 1815 to 1870—fifty-five years. Comparative peace from 1870 to 1914—forty-four years. Comparative peace from 1914 to 1939—twenty-five years. The interval between wars lessens. The horror of wars increases. That is a fact of history. And this in a period of man's greatest material progress, greatest science, greatest achievement. It is a tragic fact that in all our plans for the future, Beveridge and other schemes, good as they are and to be earnestly supported, we leave out the fundamental truth about man.

The second question arises out of this: is it, or is it not, true that human efforts fail because ordinary human nature also carries within itself the seeds of its own decay, frustration, defeat, and death? Dr. Welch guards himself against the suggestion that this means the total depravity of man, a doctrine which he believes to be 'absolutely false' and a denial of the truth that man is made in God's image. This war has shown to what tremendous heights human nature, unaided, can rise. It was the courage, self-sacrifice, and cheerfulness of people in a bad blitz that made a Bishop exclaim: 'Well, if this is original sin, let me have a lot more of it.'

But we are not always keyed up by crises. And it is the simple truth that man is powerless to be what he wants to be. And this truth, like the first, is one that stares us in the face. Most of us hate to admit it. We would run miles away from it if we could. These two truths are inevitable. Our pride rejects them but they dog us like the Hound of Heaven. They are what Dr. Welch calls the bad news about man.

And what is the good news? That is the third question. Is it, or is it not, true that, once man has escaped from the prison of his own self-sufficiency, the door is open for the inrush of a new power? The gospel says: admit that human endeavour and human nature frustrate themselves, let God take hold of you, and at once a power enters you which is not subject to frustration. You may still fail, but you will know why, and you will know how to avoid failure. You will not have reached the goal but you will have escaped from the cage. And these three truths are the background of the gospel.

The New Order.

VII. The Church in a Planned Economy.

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., R.N.

Much has been thought, spoken, and written by churchmen with regard to the essentials for a New Social Order after the war. It is strange and surely disturbing that so few have yet paid any attention to the repercussions of such a new planned order upon the Church's own life and growth.

What will be the effect of State planning on the Church? At first sight it would seem that it will result in a complete dwarfing of the Church. Church and State, at one time senior and junior partners in the life of the world, and later competitors for its control, will no longer be even comparable in influence and importance. The Church seems about to enter a period of eclipse. But this need not necessarily be so, if only the Church has the vision to seize her opportunity, and proclaim the function which she is now, as never before, called to exercise. That function

seems to be two-fold—the provision of personnel and the proclamation of an ultimate end or purpose.

It is surely as clear as can be that the best order, the most efficient plan in the world will be nullified by the absence of devoted and selfless men to operate it. To exorcise the 'something for nothing' philosophy of the workers as well as the 'nothing for nothing' dictum of the employers, will be essential if the planned economy is not to be merely an opening for graft, and manipulation. Unless those who are formulating the plan, those who are operating it, and those who are living under it are most of them motivated otherwise than by self-interest, any plan will result in chaos worse than that of the *laissez-faire* it is intended to replace. Here is where the Church's prime function lies. No other body attempts to produce, far less succeeds in producing, men and women of goodwill. If the Church fails there, nothing can save the world and the nation; nor, it may be added, the Churches as we know them.

In the second place, the Church can provide the only alternative to the materialistic end, to which the body of citizens who make up the State will otherwise devote themselves. Planning itself is, of course, a means not an end. If it is good planning it will subserve various subordinate ends—peace, employment, health, true democracy, and what not. None of these is an ultimate end. One has only to ask why democracy is better than dictatorship or peace than war to be into the realm of ultimate ends. The only body claiming authority in this realm, at least in Great Britain and U.S.A., is again—the Church.

If the Church could with sufficient power proclaim the Kingdom of God, with obedience to the will of God and His glory as the aim and object of all life; and if, further, she can produce men and women so intoxicated with the vision of the Kingdom as to put self and class second to the will of God and the welfare of their brethren, then she will not only have performed a service of supreme importance to the world, but she will have hastened the time when all things shall have been brought under the feet of Christ. If she fails, the new planned economy will be both blind and paralysed from birth.

If the Church can now make the citizens of this country and their political leaders see this, her double relevance, in the new world that is coming to be, she will be able to obtain two essentials for the adequate performance of the task. These essentials are firstly spiritual freedom, and secondly, but still importantly, adequate physical and financial resources.

The spiritual freedom of the Church under her Divine head is not something which the State can grant. It is her inherent right, and it is the duty of the State fully to recognize it. Without it the Church is strangled. A free church is, of course, not necessarily a disestablished church, but, if the choice were to be between bondage or disestablishment, the evil of disestablishment would have to be preferred. In Scotland the position of the established church is from this point of view already entirely satisfactory. The 1921 Act recognized her complete freedom in doctrine, worship, and government, the General Assembly being the supreme ecclesiastical legislative body. The Church of Scotland, however, is a real church of the people and embraces the great majority of that country's population. The Church of England, as at present constituted, is far from being able to make such a claim, so that the solution would have to be different. A semi-establishment of the Free Churches and a semi-disestablishment of the Church of England would probably be more generally accepted than the simple disestablishment of the Church of England. Spiritually free at any rate both must be, if they are to face the problems of life in the new State.

Not less essential for the Church's proper functioning are resources adequate not only for continuance but for extension. A church which is not an expanding church is not a church at all. To extend herself is her life. To do that not only at home but abroad is impossible without—to put it baldly—money. Hitherto much of that money has come directly or indirectly from the well-off and middle classes. This source is drying up, where it has not already disappeared. It is true that other institutions, voluntary hospitals, universities, sports clubs, and charities have all suffered as Income Tax, Super Tax, and Death Duties have reduced the class of the wealthy. The State, however, can and in many cases has already taken over the functions of these voluntary societies. That this way of escape is not open to the Church whose essence is freedom under Christ, has already been made clear above. It might be argued that since it is the State which has dispossessed the well-off, it is its clear duty to take over their financial obligations to the Church. The question which arises, however, is 'Will the State do this, without at the same time demanding a measure of control intolerable to the Church? Will the State—the new planned State—be content to pay the piper without also seeking to call the tune?' To answer these questions affirmatively would be an act of simple justice to the Church and of immense benefit to the nation; but relatively few of the voters would, at the moment, realize either the justice of the claim or the benefit that would accrue from its admission.

That they would not is undoubtedly due in large part to the relative failure of the Churches in the last decade. Her success in remedying the indifference or hostility of the masses to her, will be the measure of her success in the decades to come. It is certainly clear that, to obtain the recognition by the State of its financial obligations to a free Church, is not only an urgent obligation placed upon all Christian people, but also a very real duty to the State itself.

Here then are the Church's main tasks as she looks forward to a Planned Economy. She must first address herself to the task of evangelizing those upon whose utter integrity the success or failure of the New Order will depend. Secondly, she must thoughtfully and prayerfully seek to proclaim with clarity the Christian answer to such ultimate questions as 'For what has man been made? What is life's meaning?'—questions which, if unanswered, will leave man in the planned economy more restless, dissatisfied, and frustrated than in the old. Thirdly, she will have so to reform and unify herself and so clarify her position as to be worthy both of spiritual freedom and adequate resources.

These tasks are surely sufficiently immense to demand all the time and attention of the best brains and the most dedicated souls in the professional service of the Church. It is part of her tragedy that some at least of them are meantime too busy acclaiming, somewhat fulsomely, the arrival, at any rate inevitable, of that very planning which will confront the Church with such huge and relatively novel problems.

Literature.

THE AKAN DOCTRINE OF GOD.

Those who know the African native races well are apt to wax enthusiastic over them, praising their sunny-heartedness, their loyalty, their loveableness, and much else. But they leave an impression of simplicity, and of people, if not still primitive, by no means highly developed in their thinking.

Yet here comes a champion, ready to break a lance on their behalf against any faith in the whole world, sure that they have penetrated very near the heart of things and have little need of guidance from any one; that, indeed, the whole world would, it seems, be wise to sit humbly at their feet and learn of them.

Dr. J. B. Danquah, the lecturer in Twi at the London School of Oriental Studies, had prepared a massive work in three volumes. Unfortunately the first two of them, with all the notes and paraphernalia that had gone to their preparation, were destroyed by fire. The last was saved. *The Akan Doctrine of God: A Fragment of Gold Coast Ethics and Religion* (Lutterworth Press; 14s. net) is an able and scholarly work. Here are a fresh and interesting mind teasing at big problems; some breadth of reading—special thanks are given to Solovev, the Russian philosopher, Plato, Spinoza, J. S. Mill and Bradley, Wolf and Hobhouse—criticism, often shrewd and searching, of Westermann and Levy-Bruhl, and Freud and Whitehead; and an ample horizon. Of Muhammadanism, indeed, he speaks with a dislike, unusual in this calm mind, because of its lack of a doctrine of God's Fatherhood: towards Christianity he is cool; and his knowledge of it appears, at least, to be merely theoretical and formal; with the early religion of Akkad he feels at home, discovering similarities, and perhaps more, in it to his own faith. But his heart seems to warm most readily towards Japanese Emperor worship, finding in that something analogous to the Akan religion.

And what is that? Once we have cut our way through much that confuses and obscures—and these stumbling-blocks seem to be pushed aside much too easily and curtly—the heart and essence of it is the worship of God as the great and manlike Ancestor of the first man. 'As such Ancestor He deserves to be worshipped, and is worshipped, in the visible ancestral head, the good chief of the community (of whatever size).' 'Every head of a community' (including the heads of families), 'because he is in line with the Great Ancestor, must live according to the dignity of the first.' 'Ancestors, when they die, are honoured and deified. The deification makes them worshipful, even as the Great Ancestor is worshipful.' So far this does not seem very hopeful, and sounds primitive enough. But the heart of the claim is this, 'The Great Ancestor is the Great Father, and all men of the blood of that Ancestor are of Him, and are of one blood with all other men created of His blood and breath. The continuance of that blood in the continuance of the community is the greatest single factor of existence. It is an ideal worshipful in itself, and the purpose of the community is that the value of that life should be continuously kept abreast of the dignity of the Ancestor.'

Hence the Akan answer to the ever reiterated human question, What is the good? is 'the practice in society of doing good, in other words, beneficence. The emphasis is on the social nature of the good. Whatever the eternal aim is, it is an aim for society. Its good is what counts.'

Although there are places where he seems categorically to assert precisely that, one does not

suppose that Dr. Danquah seriously argues that the simpler of his countrymen have thought out, say, the five abstract and philosophical canons, and the eight dark and metaphysical postulates, which he finds in and behind their faith ; but, rather, that he is declaring unto us and them what they ignorantly worship, as the Apostle boldly said. In any case, it is all very confident, and often impressive, if not always convincing. Bergson, for example, held that life consists of a number of concentric and ever widening circles, each with its duties and responsibilities. And that a natural morality does guide and help, as far out as the limits of one's own nation. But there, he holds, it stops, can lead no farther ; and only the moralities of the great religions, like Christianity and Muhammadanism, can leap across the void, and include other alien peoples in their sweep. Dr. Danquah is quite sure that his own faith, too, does this, ' that at the centre of the contribution that Akan doctrine makes to the thought of man ' is the idea that as the family, the tribe, the nation, is linked and held together by reverence for the chief, who represents God to them, so all humanity ' is linked and held together by one contemporary ancestor, one anointed head, one Pope-Philosopher-King,' and ought to rise above mere racial and national interests into this vaster whole.

Again, many, Harnack and MacMurray among them, have laid it down that modern history begins with Christ's discovery of the individual, a being immensely valuable in himself, though finding his true life only in the service of a Kingdom more important even than himself. And they would say that to push him back into the mass again, as the Akan seem to do, into the position of multitudes of present-day Indians, who, even now, have no clear consciousness of their own separate individuality, and think of themselves as each an undifferentiated part of a greater whole, in short to arrest, or reverse, what Hegel called the ' de-universalizing of the individual ' is, not progress, but retrogression. No doubt a main problem is to ride the marches between the rights of the individual and the claims of the community. What we call natural liberty, the Nazis dismiss contemptuously as selfish licence. We think of them as abject slaves, but they are willing slaves. Dr. Danquah's solution is that there is no personal immortality strictly so called but a kind of transmigration, that, if not exactly we, a being that results from us, and carrying the fruits of our past along with it, moves on, and is reborn repeatedly among people at all stages ; and that, by fashioning ourselves aright, we can keep helping others round us down the ages. Perhaps it is all as he says. But a doubt keeps intruding that this is a very Europeanized reading of a simple faith. Still, one remembers a sage dictum of Montefiore that a true account of a religion can never be written, because those outside it cannot know its secret ; while those who hold it are inevitably prejudiced in its favour. If we, aliens to the Akan faith, fall under the first condemnation, will Dr. Danquah think it less than fair if he seems to us guilty of that second charge ?

But the Lutterworth Press has done well to give him so full an opportunity to state his case. This he has done with skill. And one is always glad of yet more evidence of the joyous truth that God has never left Himself without a witness ; and that there is a Light that lighteneth every man that comes into the world. A. J. GOSSIP.

THE WITNESS OF MATTHEW AND MARK TO CHRIST.

' A new face has been put upon life by the blessed thing which God did when he offered up his only begotten Son.' That is the very beautiful sentence from the late J. G. Machen which Dr. Ned Bernard Stonehouse prefixes to his book, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (Presbyterian Guardian, Philadelphia ; $2.50). Dr. Stonehouse, who is Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, holds much the same theological position as Machen whose fine book ' The Origin of Paul's Religion ' will be known to some of our readers ; and in Stonehouse, as in Machen, we find conservatism admirably allied with immense erudition. This book, as the author tells us in his preface, is to be followed by a second volume on the witness of Luke and John to Christ. Meanwhile in his first volume which contains eight chapters (each prefaced by a synopsis), four being devoted to Mark and four to Matthew, Dr. Stonehouse raises anew the old question of what the witness of the Gospels to Christ really is. He raises it anew because the liberals on the one hand tell us that Mark, for example, is history with a minimum of theology, while our latter-day radicals tell us that it is a theological construction rather than history. ' The ultimate issue with respect to the Gospels,' Dr. Stonehouse declares, ' is not whether they present facts alone or doctrine alone, but whether the meaning they ascribe to the facts is their true meaning.' Dr. Stonehouse believes (as do most of us who have not sold our souls to the extreme sceptics in criticism) that it is the true meaning ; and he sets himself by a careful examination of the Gospels to show that it is so. In the course of his proof, however, he is compelled to take issue with liberals and radicals (especially the latter), and it is his criticism of the extremer German scholars, with their followers in Britain, which is the most interesting part of his book. Very timely is his refutation of R. H. Lightfoot's theory (propounded in ' Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels ') that Mark thought of Galilee as the seat of the revelation of the Son of God, and of Jerusalem as the scene of sin and hostility. Scarcely less excellent are his strictures on Wrede's theory about the Messianic theory in the Gospels. The tone of the whole discussion is admirable ; but it is a profound pity that the writing is so diffuse and difficult, for Dr. Stonehouse has many good points to make (for example, on Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi). The English reader will find some of his Americanisms (idioms, for example, like ' it is doubtful *that* ' and words like ' inscripturation ') rather trying, as he will find the style often

ponderous and the book, with its detailed discussion, 'heavy going'; but if he is interested in German radical criticism, in the question of the Ending of St. Mark, and in 'realized eschatology,' there is much here to enlighten him and to reward his patience. A. M. HUNTER.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY.

The Bampton Lectures for 1942 have now been issued. They come from the pen of the historical scholar who wrote recently on 'The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great.' He is the Rev. Trevor Gervase Jalland, D.D., Vicar of St. Thomas the Martyr, Oxford; and his subject is *The Church and the Papacy* (S.P.C.K.; 25s. net). He has produced a volume that could have been described as goodly even before these days of paper economy, and that is distinguished by clarity of style, balance of treatment, and careful scholarship; nor does the documentation appear to leave anything to be desired.

The aim of the book is to give an historical survey of the relations of the Papacy and the Christian Church, paying particular attention to their character within the formative period of the first six centuries. The author zealously subscribes to the dictum that 'history should be studied always as a process; not as a picture.' And he is of the firm opinion that the development of the Papacy is 'one of the more remarkable and impressive phenomena in the long record of human achievement.'

With no little plausibility he would justify the appearance of a new work covering ground already so well trodden. There is room at present, as he contends, for a work that takes account of the most recent results of textual research and criticism, that does not treat the Papacy 'with an admiration too blind or a hatred too fierce,' that—in a word—follows after the ideal, in the last resort unattainable, of absolute objectivity.

The following sentences, with which many will be in sympathy, provide a good clue to the author's standpoint and outlook: 'To those to whom the ultimate demands of papal doctrine seem in the end unacceptable there must come inevitably a sense of tragedy that so great gifts as those which the Roman See appears to have enjoyed did not in fact prove capable of better use in the interests of Christendom as a whole. It may be that by a fuller recognition of its status in the history of our Faith there will grow a more generous acknowledgment of its appropriate place in the glorious reunited Christendom of the future.'

The book begins with a description of the 'apotheosis' of the Roman See at the Vatican Council; the description hinging upon the remark of Monsignor Louis Haynald, Archbishop of Kalocsa, to Monsignor Felix Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, as in the glimmering daylight of Monday, July 18, 1870, an express train which had left Rome the previous evening was clanking on its way across the plains of Lombardy: 'Monseigneur, nous avons fait une grande faute.'

The development that culminated in the doctrine of 'the infallible *magisterium* of the Roman bishop' is then traced from its beginnings and through its course. Dr. Jalland is of the belief that our Lord intended to create a permanent, universal, while at the same time exclusive, society of His disciples; that ἐκκλησιά signifies in the first instance the totality of the Christian fellowship, and only secondarily serves to describe a community domiciled in a particular locality; that the extensive authority assigned by anticipation to St. Peter in the *Tu es Petrus* is amply supported; and that a decidedly favourable verdict ought to be given regarding the tradition of the Apostle's residence and death in Rome.

Passing to the subject of the origin and primitive organization of the Church of Rome, Dr. Jalland reaches the conclusion that some further ground has been won in the direction of vindicating episcopacy as an integral and primitive element in the organization, and of its justification as an apostolic institution. This leads to a discussion of the surviving evidence as to the attitude of non-Roman Christians to the Church or the Bishop of Rome during the period previous to the Council of Nicaea, as also to an analysis of the signs of papal self-consciousness already manifest in that period.

There follows the consideration of the Papacy in relation to the Constantinian autocracy and to the later Roman Empire; and then—in more rapid survey—in relation to mediæval Christendom and modern Europe; and the essential continuity of the papal theory and practice in the nineteenth century is finally indicated.

The reader of this able and learned work will agree that it is eminently worthy of its place in the succession of the Bampton Lectures. He will also agree, no matter where his ecclesiastical sympathies may lie, that the Lecturer has honestly tried to maintain a strictly objective standpoint. Nor will he be inclined to gainsay the concluding affirmation: 'It must remain the constant and ineluctable duty of all Christians in their separate groups so to seek by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost better to understand the outlook of others, that, when the day of reconciliation is at hand, no ignorance or ill-founded prejudice may be found to hinder the fulfilment of the will of Him who prayed "that they may be One."'

W. FULTON.

SOME LITTLE BOOKS.

One advantage of the paper shortage is that it has forced some writers to put briefly the gist of their message, whereas formerly they would take up half of a large book recapitulating what all their predecessors had said. At any rate we have some very good small books on a variety of subjects. *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, by Professor Edgar P. Dickie (S.C.M.; 6s. net) is a first-rate treatment of what may be called popular theology. It deals with the Christian view of man, preserving a fair balance between Barth and Humanism. It also deals with the grounds of religious belief as a background to the other theme.

It is sound, good teaching and incidentally it is full of sermons in the seed. *Like a Shaft of Glory*, and other addresses, by the Rev. A. Elwyn Tingley, A.M., Ph.D. (Stockwell; 2s. net), is like the title, a little flamboyant but full of matter all the same. *Art, Religion and the Common Life*, by Mr. Horace B. Pointing (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is a good account of an interesting theme. Art must have a religious background. It is only possible if the common life is sound and this is possible only if religion is real and alive. Also the artist brings something essential to religion in his turn. This is a deeply religious book and the subject of it was well worth the good treatment it receives. *The Authority of the Church*, by the Rev. T. H. D. Edwards, is a paper read at a Clerical Club and is an extremely able treatment of an important subject. It is to be had (price 6d.) from the Rev. H. B. Barrow, 27 Collingwood Terrace, Blyth. It ought to be issued by a publisher, for it is unusually competent. *The Message of Jesus for our Times*, by Mr. W. M. Ryburn, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 1s. 3d. net), is a series of addresses on general religious subjects. They are quite good but do not quite merit the rather ambitious title. *The Brotherhood Book of Devotion*, by Mr. J. E. Evans, B.A. (Epworth Press; 5s. net), arose out of a discovered need. The author has been leader of the 'Fellowship of Prayer' in the Brotherhood Movement, and has contributed devotional articles to the Brotherhood Journal, 'The Outlook.' The desire for more extended guidance prompted this book. It has two parts, the first consisting of short chapters on prayer, the second a course of Bible readings and prayers for regular use. We can heartily commend this book in both its parts. The talks on prayer are devout and intelligent, and many of the prayers in the second part are just what such prayers should be. They are compiled from various sources, ancient and modern. *What Manner of Man is This?*, by the Rev. W. R. Maltby, D.D. (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is a book of addresses for Holy Week. Most people know something of their gifted author, his devout spirit and his original mind. *The Wrath and the Peace of God*, and other studies, by the Rev. Stephen Neill, Bishop of Tinnevelly (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). These addresses were given to a missionary convention. They are really readings in the Epistle to the Romans and the author remarks that he has chosen this letter because revival in the Church has more than once been closely connected with renewed study of it. He finds a true parallel between Christianity and Rome on the one hand and Indian Christianity and Hinduism on the other, and his studies of the situation of the early Christians and its bearing on our own day are acute and helpful. *The English Mediæval Recluse*, by Mr. Francis D. S. Darwin, F.R.Hist.S. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is a fascinating study of a notable figure of the Middle Ages. The recluse was an anchorite, not a hermit. The hermit was a solitary, yet he could wander about at liberty. The anchorite was shut up in a cell, or at any rate in a dwelling, and never came out. But he was not so confined as popular ideas picture him. He (or more often she) might have a servant to look after him (or her). Visitors were allowed, and the recluse could work for his living. *Christendom in the Modern World*, by the Rev. Geoffrey Holland (Lutterworth Press; 1s. 3d. net), is a plea by a Chaplain serving with His Majesty's Forces in India for leadership and to that end for unity in the Church. *What Christians Stand For in the Secular World*, by the Archbishop of Canterbury (S.C.M.; 6d. net), is reprinted from 'The Christian News Letter.' Dr. Temple wrote it in response to a request that he might indicate to what extent there exists a real and effective common Christian mind about fundamental problems. The significance of this statement is that Dr. Temple believes that what he says here does represent an 'observable convergence' among Christians who really think. The themes he deals with are on the lines of thoughts which the Archbishop has made familiar. *Evangelism in the Youth Club*, by the Rev. Bryan H. Reed, B.D. (Epworth Press; 1s. net), is inspired by certain convictions—first that the Christian message is the only gospel for our need, secondly that young people are naturally and normally religious, and thirdly that we in the churches should think not merely of the religious education of our own young people but of the evangelization of the multitude outside. *Peter: The Adventures of a Chorister (1137–1937)*, by the Rev. Sydney H. Nicholson (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is a perfectly delightful fantasy. Peter lives through all these centuries from the twelfth to the twentieth and he is always a choir boy. This quaint conceit enables the author to give us pictures of the Church life of all the centuries. The author's aim is to interest and instruct the choir boy of to-day, and he certainly deserves to succeed in this aim. The book is a most charming imaginative construction. It is lively, picturesque, full of incident, human, and should appeal to all young people whether choristers or not, and to all old people too. *Richmond College, 1843–1943*, edited by Mr. Frank H. Cumbers (Epworth Press; 5s. net), is a volume of commemorative essays written by old Richmond men. The Place, Down the Years, the Tutors and the Studies, the Men—these titles indicate the contents. The book is meant to appeal to Richmond graduates of the past and present and will be a very pleasant record and souvenir for them.

The Carey Press has sent out two new issues in their Furnival Library for young people (paper covers, 1s. 6d., cloth, 2s. 6d. net). *The Steel Helmet* is by Mr. J. I. Carlyle Litt, and consists of talks about familiar objects, like a box of paints, diaries, match-boxes, a camera, a pair of scissors, and so on. They are ingenious and suggestive. There are twenty-five of these objects, the title of the book being taken from what is generally known as a 'tin hat.'

Og, the Giant is by the Rev. William Thomas, B.D., and is of a similar nature. Frank and Flossie go here, there, and everywhere and find lots to ask questions about, which enables the author

to draw suitable lessons. If not Frank and Flossie, then Peter and Eric ask the questions. Road-makers, P.T.O., Air., ornaments, sunbeams, flags, are some of the subjects dealt with. Both books are useful and interesting.

The latest addition to Cassell's 'The Living Thoughts Library' is a volume on Swedenborg—*The Living Thoughts of Swedenborg*, by the Rev. Eric A. Sutton, M.A., B.D. (3s. 6d. net). The main part of the volume consists of selections from Swedenborg's thoughts on Heaven and Hell; Divine Providence; God; Marriage; Life and Love; The Church; The Infinite, and the Final Cause of Creation. The selections on the last-named subject are from a work of Swedenborg's philosophical period, on the other subjects from works of his (later) theological period. A useful preface of twenty-two pages gives a clear account of Swedenborg's life and achievements; and it is a merit of the preface that while it is sympathetic and indeed admiring it is not undiscriminating. Mr. Sutton allows, for instance, that there may be varied opinions regarding the claims made by Swedenborg in respect of his Divine mission. We add that Swedenborg's works are carefully tabulated.

In *Freedom in the Faith* (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net) the late Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., takes up the cudgels in defence of theological liberalism. He holds that 'the modern reaction against liberalism is really a veiled attack on freedom and may easily saddle us with a yoke of bondage far heavier than we can bear.' Theological liberalism is 'neither dead nor damned, though there are certain phases of it and certain conclusions drawn from it which we have already outgrown.' In particular, that type of it which was current in the latter half of the nineteenth century was unduly influenced by the predominance of the physical sciences and the evolution theory, which tended towards a humanism that made man practically independent of God. Dr. Selbie desires no return to the old orthodoxy, against which liberalism was a healthy reaction, but he aims at a restatement of the evangelical faith which, while conserving the divine truth, would make it more intelligible and acceptable to the modern mind. His sketch, brief and rapid as it is, is highly suggestive and conciliatory. The concluding chapter on Freedom, Toleration and Reunion, is eminently sane and illuminating, but one could have wished that he had analysed the concept of Freedom more deeply. Has a man as good a 'right' to teach error as to teach truth? If so, whence is this 'right' derived? And suppose some are teaching totalitarian doctrine with the manifest intention of forcibly suppressing all opposition as soon as they gain power does freedom demand that they shall be given every facility for propagating their views?

A book which is designed to help young people to read the Gospels intelligently, with appreciation of the message and of the writers and the original readers and much else, is a very useful publication. In *Let's Read the Gospels* (Methodist Youth Department, Ludgate Circus House, E.C.4) the Rev. Wilfrid J. Doidge, B.A., B.D., has provided such a book, and it is a good book. It deals with the early Christian communities, the authorship and contents of the several Gospels, with special chapters on 'The Interpreter of Peter' and 'The Beloved Physician' and the Synoptic Problem. A good deal of intelligent reading has gone to the making of Mr. Doidge's book, and we find from the bibliography at the close that he has gone to the right authorities. There are questions appended to each chapter which will help to guide discussion if the book is used in Guilds, Clubs, Training Classes, and such like young people's societies.

Three books on method in religious education may be mentioned together. The first, *Religious Education in the Senior School*, by Mr. R. L. Arundale, Headmaster, St. John's College Senior School, York (Nelson; 8s. 6d. net), is a very thorough treatment of the subject generally and especially of its application to senior pupils. In the author's own words, it includes accounts of current practice, sample schemes of work, and notes on experiments that have been found successful in a variety of post-primary schools and with various grades of children. The author has always in his mind the sound idea that religious instruction is not mere 'instruction' but training—training in worship and service. He aims also, not at imposing any method but at suggesting what teachers may use for experiments. There are chapters on school worship, on the use of the Bible, on Biblical criticism, on the Old and New Testaments, on the growth of the Church, on the Syllabus (helping teachers to make their own), on the oral lesson, on written work and private study, and on teaching aims. These are the heads of chapters which are rich in wisdom and guidance and most of all in inspiration. This is a first-rate book and should be known to and used by teachers who are looking for the kind of help that stimulates without checking originality. The other books are both 'Christian Education Handbooks,' one for the *Primary Course* (third year), the other for the *Junior Course* (also third year). The general subjects dealt with in both are such as these: Jesus and His Friends, The Bible: the Word of God, Pictures of God and the Christian Faith, The Harvest of the Earth, Friends in other Lands. Each of these subjects is rich in suggestion, and one of the interesting things about the two Courses is to see how the same subject is treated for the primaries on the one hand and the juniors on the other. The two books deserve high praise for the help given to the teacher and the way in which interest is given to each topic by suitable illustration. The Editor is Mr. H. A. Hamilton, and the publishers the Religious Education Press (4s. 6d. net each).

A delightful little magazine, with the clever title *Socratic Digest* (Oxonian Press, Oxford; 1s. net), prints some of the utterances at what seems a

discussion club in Oxford. The most interesting contribution is Mr. C. S. Lewis's discourse on 'Bulverism,' so named from its (imaginary) inventor. Bulverism is the habit of assuming that your opponent is wrong and then explaining his error. This is expounded with Mr. Lewis's usual paradoxical wit. There is also a paper by Professor Hodges on 'Philosophy To-day' and several other more fragmentary contributions. The club is called 'The Oxford University Socratic Club,' and discussion appears to be free for all.

Rabbi Dr. Samuel Daiches has published under the title, *The Revelation of Hope* (Oxonian Press, Oxford), a sermon preached by him on the First Day of Pentecost, 5704/1944, at the Synagogue, Richmond Road, Oxford. It is a simple exposition, in the main, of the Scriptural passages appointed to be read at the Festival of Revelation: Exodus xix, xx; Ezekiel i. iii. 12; Habakkuk ii. 20, iii; Ruth. The impressive refrain is, 'The Bible is open. The revelation continues.'

Further Tales to Tell to Little Children, by Elsie Helena Spriggs and Others (Religious Education Press; 3s. 6d. net), is the third of a series which has found acceptance with the little ones and their teachers. The present tales, over a score in number, are in three sections—Jesus the Children's Friend, Friendly Children Everywhere, and Friendly Things. They are told in a bright and simple way and are fitted to teach the children love to Jesus and sympathy with all God's creatures. The admirable drawings by Christine Jackson give additional vividness to the stories.

How Can I Bear Suffering?, by Mr. M. L. Christlieb (Rich and Cowan; 5s. net), is a little book which 'addresses itself to all who mourn, or who find the burden of life heavy.' It appeals less to reason than to sentiment. More than a third of the book is devoted to the report of spiritist communications which some may find helpful, but many will feel to be tedious. The practical aim of the writer is to show that by the practice of certain methods of spiritual culture a pathway may be opened to these spirit communications, and through them to comfort and peace. With all this it should be said that there is here much Christian counsel and many cheering examples of spiritual help in time of trouble.

The Rev. Gordon W. Ireson, Diocesan Missioner of Exeter and Hon. Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter, has published a Handbook for Clergy and Teachers which has sprung from the conviction, tested by experience, that instead of trying to make the Christian Faith fit modern people we should try to fit modern people for the Christian Faith. The work is entitled, *Church Worship and the Non-Churchgoer* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). It is a work intended primarily for use in the Church of England, and is animated by great loyalty to the Prayer Book, departures from whose services are regarded as undermining ecclesiastical authority. The purpose of the book is to further the effort to unite Christian worship and Christian truth. It seeks to do so by showing how people can be initiated into Christian worship as part of their instruction in the Christian Faith. Unless they are initiated into Christian worship at the time they are being approached 'on the level of Christian dogma,' it is unlikely that the supernatural truth of the faith will ever become translated for them into supernatural living. It is a very practical handbook, as indeed the titles of the various chapters may indicate: The Present Situation (in which a wide gulf is recognized as existing between those who are within the liturgical tradition and practice of Christian worship and those who are without it), The Catechumenate (in which the plea is made for admission to First Communion before the ratification of Baptismal vows), Training in Worship, The Eucharist, Morning and Evening Prayer, Worship and Drama. Among the Appendices are an Order of Festival Service and hints for Church Parades and Special Services.

In his Preface to an unusually interesting and ably written book on *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), Professor R. V. G. Tasker, B.D., of the Chair of New Testament Exegesis in the University of London, says that the great change in Gospel criticism has been the swing-over from the historical-critical method of approach, which endeavoured confidently to reconstruct the life of Jesus by separating primary from secondary material in the Gospels, to the theological-critical approach, which regards all the Gospel material as influenced by Christian doctrine. This book is written from the latter standpoint. Appropriately, the first lecture is on 'The Gospel behind the Gospels,' and the Professor contends that the idea of doctrine as a later development of Christianity, or an addition to it, is wrong. There has never been an undoctrinal Christianity. He endeavours to show that the Christian documents presuppose belief in a particular set of doctrines and that it is the uniqueness of the doctrines that accounts for the uniqueness of the Gospels, which are not just history, though they contain history, or biographies, though there is a biographical element in them, or theological treatises, though there is theology in them, or books of devotion, though we cannot exaggerate their devotional value, but which are first and foremost records of certain deeds and sayings which are pregnant with meaning because they are the deeds of God Himself wrought in the human life of Him whom a body of men regarded as their Lord and Master.

This is a book endlessly interesting because it is the work of a competent scholar who knows how to teach and how to write and who looks at things with his own eyes. The titles of the chapters are as follows, after the first, The Earliest Written Sources (on Q and Mark), The Gospel of Matthew, The Gospel of Luke, The Kingdom of God in Jewish Expectation, The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels, and The Fourth Gospel. It is all good, though not all infallible.

In *The Silent Church* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net) Dr. Julius Rieger deals with a difficult problem, 'the problem of the German Confessional Witness.' He tries to show that the true Church in Germany must be silent about many things which she confesses (*i.e.*, proclaims), and that the Church not infrequently confesses, proclaims, and speaks when she is silent. This paradox is pursued earnestly and persuasively throughout the argument. No one can judge the German Confessional Church until the true facts are known, and even then few of us will be able or willing to do more than appreciate the courage and faithfulness of our fellow-Christians in Germany.

The Ordeal of the Reformed Churches, by Mr. Alexander McLeish (World Dominion Press; 1s. net), is the seventh of the 'War-Time Survey Series.' It deals with the religious situation in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Hungary, and Poland. The writer's method is historical and he devotes the bulk of his space to the fortunes of the Reformed Churches in these countries from the time of the Reformation. Less room, accordingly, is left for a picture of present-day conditions. Perhaps there is too great a tendency to multiply details and statistics, but the account given, if not inspiring, is informative and should prove useful for reference.

Did Matthew and Luke use a 'Western' Text of Mark?

By the Reverend C. S. C. Williams, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain Merton College, Oxford.

In his article in The Expository Times, LV. No. 7, April 1944, pp. 180 ff., the Reverend T. F. Glasson gave thirty-seven instances to open up a 'suggestive line of inquiry' leading to the opinion that Matthew and Luke used a 'Western' text of Mark. 'All that is implied,' he said, 'by "Western text" in our title is that some of the readings which we now know as Western were already present in the copies of Mark employed by Matthew and Luke—these MSS. were what may be called early Western, or incipient Western.' He would not therefore imply that a 'Western' recension of Mark had been carried out before the second century, indeed before *c.* A.D. 80 when Luke was written. It is indeed highly probable that some variant readings of the Marcan text lay before Matthew and Luke or one of them and were later incorporated into a 'Western' recension: and it is true that the 'Western' recension was apparently made during the first half of the second century, long before our oldest uncials were written and perhaps before even the oldest Gospel papyrus fragment (of St. John [1]) existed, if one may speak of a 'Western recension' when the phrase 'Western' covers a whole mass of non-Alexandrian, non-Cæsarean, pre-Byzantine readings. One of the most pressing problems in textual criticism to-day is to split up the far from homogeneous elements in the so-called 'Western' text of the Gospels on a scientific basis. Does Mr. Glasson's theory help to do so, by pointing to 'incipient Western' readings? It is doubtful whether it does. About twenty-two of Mr. Glasson's instances are instances of omissions in the D text of Mark in common with Matthew and Luke or with one of them. These are 'arguments from silence,' which are always precarious, and are so especially when one reflects that the D text of the Gospels, not of Acts, tends to be short and when one finds that many of the omissions are found in Tatian's Diatessaron (so far as it can be reconstructed). The latter had a profound influence upon textual tradition in both East and West, as the present writer has tried to show elsewhere.[2] Without endorsing von Soden's too hasty acceptance of many of the readings of the Arabic Diatessaron (a text unfortunately assimilated to the Syriac Vulgate or Peshitta (Syr$^{P.}$)) as genuine Tatianic readings, and without accepting his theory that almost all early variants were due to Tatian's popular Gospel harmony, one may reflect that the codex form had replaced the roll form of the Gospels before the 'Western recension' was made,[3] scribes being able the more easily therefore to compare one passage with another and to mark the omissions, variants, and additions, and that before the second century was over a skilful harmony of all four Gospels was made, which affected the textual tradition even of the 'separate Gospels.' Another excellent reason for

[1] *P. Ryl. Greek*, 457, ed. C. H. Roberts.

[2] 'Tatian and the text of Mark and Matthew,' in *J.T.S.*, xliii. (1942), 37–42.

[3] C. A. Phillips, 'The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,' in *E.T.* xlv. (1933–34), 56; cf. C. H. Roberts, in *J.T.S.*, xl. (1939), 253–7.

taking Tatian's harmony into account is that his text was largely based (according to Burkitt [1]) on a text current probably in Rome in the third quarter of the second century A.D. and may have some claim to witness better even than D sometimes to a truly Western (in the geographical sense) text of the Gospels.

The principles governing the use of Tatian's evidence have been summed up in A. Merk's *Prolegomena* to his second edition of the New Testament, p. 12*; 'Quoniam textus arabicus Tatiani multas lectiones communes cum syr^{p} habet, quaeritur num hae lectiones Tatiano attribui possint an potius syr^{p} propriæ sint. Primo notamus Tatianum frequenter a syr^{p} discedere et proinde in multis a syr^{p} esse independentem. Deinde ubi Tatianus et syr^{p} conveniunt, saepissime accedunt syr^{v} [*i.e.* syr$^{c.s.}$], vetus latina, armenia, georgica versio, ex codicibus græcis D W Θ vel alii codices, qui a syr^{p} sunt independentes. Unde patet has lectiones esse syr^{p} antiquiores et recte Tatiano attribui.' The following Tatianic references are taken from J. Hamlyn Hill's *Earliest Life of Christ being the Diatessaron of Tatian*, which includes J. Armitage Robinson's translation of the Armenian version of the fragments of Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron. Where Tatian's evidence cannot be applied to Mr. Glasson's instances, we hope to show that there are other explanations than his of the agreement between Matthew, Luke, and the D text of Mark against Mark.[2]

To take the instances in Mr. Glasson's order:

(1) Mk 2^{27} το σαββατον . . . ωστε om. D a c e ff^{2} i. These words are attested, however, by Tatian ar. Eph. (Hill, *op. cit.*, 71 and 341). Lagrange in his *Critique Textuelle* (p. 52) says 'S'il a omis το σαββατον . . . ωστε, il a pu penser que ces mots absents de Mt. et Lc. faisaient double emploi, sinon opposition avec ce qui est dans Mc. et dans Mt.

(2) Mk 2^{19b}, Mark's D with Matthew and Luke omit 'as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast': this omission is found also in Tatian (Hill, p. 70) W 33, 700 fam^{1}. Syr^{p}. It may well be due to homoioteleuton, the scribe's eye passing from one νηστευειν to another. Lagrange (*ib.*) comments, 'Le réviseur a pu constater que ces mots n'étaient ni dans Mt. ni dans Lc. mais que par ailleurs ils faisaient double emploi avec ce qui précédait.'

(3) Mk 1^{10}. Mark wrote σχιζομενους, D ηνυγμενους (sic), Matthew ανεῳχθησαν, Luke ανεῳχθηναι. Here Syr^{s} is lacking, and D is supported by lat. Syr^{pal}. Cop^{sa}. Matthew and Luke corrected Mark's uncouth word independently: the Western reviser may have done the same. Lagrange (p. 43) gives this reading of D first among those cited under 'Les expressions savoureuses par leur étrangeté apparente, mais bizarre pour le commun, se trouvent surtout dans Mc.'

(4) Mk 9^{35}. και λεγει . . . διακονος om. D k. The omission may be due to the scribe's eye passing from ΔΩΛΕΚΑ to ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟC. Matthew has a similar saying elsewhere in 20^{26} 23^{11} and Luke in 9^{48b} and 22^{26}. Tatian did not use Mk 9^{35} (Hill, p. 142).

(5) Mk 15^{25}. εσταυρωσαν, Matthew ετηρουν, Marcan D εφυλασσον. C. H. Turner went too far in supporting peculiar 'Western' readings like this as original, but if it is original, it is not an instance supporting Mr. Glasson's theory. Lagrange comments (p. 45), 'Il est contraire à la précision du style de dire deux fois la même chose. Dans Mt 15^{25} εσταυρωσαν a l'air d'une répétition de ce qui vient d'être dit: c'est afin d'en marquer l'heure. Mais D dit εφυλασσον (a f n r) . . . qu'il a cru mieux en situation. Pourtant les soldats ne gardaient pas puisqu'ils procèdent au crucifiement des brigands! D ne veut pas en avoir le démenti, et en écrivant σταυρουνται l. σταυρουσιν, 15^{27}, il atténue l'activité des soldats. Cependent, il se trahit lui-même, car s'il a mis λησται au nominatif, il continue avec ενα.' Matthew's ετηρουν was probably a reminiscence of Ps 21 (22) 18 b αὐτοὶ δὲ κατενόησαν καὶ ἐπεῖδόν με: and D's εφυλασσον was derived from it, not vice versa.

(6) Mk 2^{16}. οτι] διατι ℵ W D Cop. Syr^{p} Tat. Matthew and Luke.

(7) Mk 2^{23}. οδον ποιειν om. W D b c e ff^{2} i t Matthew and Luke. The infinitive caused difficulty, as it seemed to imply that the disciples cut themselves a path, plucking ears of corn: hence the variant οδοιπορουντες τιλλειν. It was natural for Matthew and Luke and any later reviser to avoid this implication. Tatian ar. follows Mt 12^{1} approximately: 'and rubbing the ears of corn with their hands, they were eating' cf. Tat. Eph. 'they began to pluck the ears, to rub and to eat' (Hill, pp. 70 and 341).

(8) Mk 4^{10}. Matthew and Luke have a natural 'coincident alteration'[3] of Mark's verbose phrase, 'they that were about him with

[1] *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 210.

[2] We exercise the textual critic's licence to omit breathings and accents.

[3] Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, ch. 11.

the twelve.' οι μαθηται was read by Tatian W D 565 Syr^{s} cf. Arm. (cf. Hill, p. 107).

(9) Mk 4^{10}, 'asked him the parables,' a difficult phrase. D's τις η παραβολη αυτη may be derived from Tatian's 'What is this parable?' (Tatian seems to be using Mark here) rather than Luke's 'What this parable might be' (Hill, p. 107).

(10) Mk 4^{11}. D adds γνωναι with Matthew and Luke^{1} (cf. Lat. Syr$^{p.hl.}$ Arm. Geo.). Tatian, 'Unto you is given the knowledge of the secrets of the Kingdom of God' (Hill, p. 108). The Armenian and Georgian evidence would suggest that this reading was known in an ancient Syriac text of Mark.

(11) Mk 4^{16}. D with 579, 700, 565. Syr$^{s.p.}$ Arm. Geo. Cop. and W, like Matthew and Luke omit ομοιως. So does Tatian, who uses Mt 13^{20} (Tat$^{ar.\ and\ Eph.}$) cf. Hill, *op. cit.*, 109 and 350.

(12) Mk 5^{14}. D with ℵ C Θ read εξ- (before ηλθον) with Matthew and Luke. ἐξ- here would be a natural correction of Mark: Tatian$^{ar.}$ follows Luke and probably had εξ-. This, however, may be one of the instances when D^{Gk} was influenced by its Latin side d, for it contained egressi sunt. J. Rendel Harris (Codex Bezae, in *Texts and Studies*, ii. 53 ff.) showed how strong was the interaction between the Greek and Latin sides of the Bezan text, D and d.

(13) Mk 8^{27}. D omits αυτοις after λεγων with ℵ^{c} L Δ 3, 108, 218, 517, 579, 892, it.$^{plen.}$ Cop$^{bo.\ (aliq.)}$ Arm. As Matthew had αυτου and Luke αυτους just before, then αυτοις was naturally omitted on stylistic grounds.

(14) Mk 9^{3}. 'Such as no fuller on earth could whiten them.' For γναφευς D has τις. The phrase is discussed by Burkitt, *Evangelion Da Mepharreshe*, ii. 240 f., who, like Hill (p. 138), shows that Tat.$^{ar.}$ had 'His raiment became (exceeding) white as snow and as the brightness of lightning, so that nothing on earth can become so bright.' The variant ως χιων, found in Syr^{s} X a n may be no older than Tatian. Some Greek MSS., like 33, 379, 872, conflate both readings. D and Syr^{p} omit γναφευς, but D has τις instead. The purpose of these alterations was to avoid mentioning 'fuller' whose trade seemed too banal! (cf. A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, 119). Matthew, Luke, and the 'correctors' of Mark like D missed the Marcan allusion to Mal 3^{2}, ως πόα πλυνόντων. If Matthew and Luke had D's τις in front of them, why did they not reproduce it? If they had written οια ουδεις . . . or some such phrase, then they could be cited in support of Mr. Glasson's theory.

(15) Mk 10$^{23f.}$. D transposes these two verses: Matthew and Luke omit *v.*^{24} Cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, 69 and 479 f., who says that this verse in one or other of its forms may be a 'pious accidental interpolation in the original Mark. But if so, it must have occurred at a very early stage; how otherwise account for the reminiscence of it in Mt 19^{24} ("And again I say unto you . . .")?' Assuming, however, its authenticity, Kirk gives two alternative suggestions, the second of which is more convincing; 'that *v.*^{24} originally read, "How hard it is *for a rich man* to enter the kingdom" (a mere repetition of *v.*^{23}). So Matthew and Luke omitted the redundancy. ℵ B κ [the best Alexandrian and Carthaginian evidence] left out "for a rich man": A C Θ, with Pr 12^{28} in mind, altered the sense by adding, "for them that trust in riches." D attempted to "correct the confusion of A C Θ by transposing *vv.*^{24} and ^{25}, without noticing that this attached greater amazement to the difficulty of those who *trusted* in riches entering the kingdom, than to that of rich men in general." However, Tat.$^{ar.\ and\ Ephr.}$ attests the words "for them that trust in their possessions" in *v.*^{24} (Hill, p. 157 and 360, where the Armenian verb for "trust" is "hope"); it is striking that Tatian the Encratite did not follow Luke's omission of *v.*^{24}, which "blunted the ascetic tone"' (Kirk).

(16) Mk 10^{27}. D's reading 'With men this is impossible but it is possible with God' is supported by k a ff^{2} (cf. 157 b c r). If Matthew read D's version here, why did he say 'all things,' cf. Luke 'the things'; one would on that theory expect simply, 'it' or 'this.' Tat.$^{ar.}$ has 'with men this is not possible, but with God. God can do all things' (Hill, p. 157).

(17) Mk 12^{7}. D it. (exc. q) vg. Aeth. Arm. omit εκεινοι with Matthew and Luke. So too Tatian who uses Mt 21$^{38(a)}$: in any case εκεινοι would seem too emphatic and would be naturally omitted.

(18) Mk 14^{48}. D omits αποκριθεις: so does Tatian following Mt 26^{55}. The omission of αποκριθεις with a verb of saying is not uncommon in MSS., especially the Syriac, cf. Mk 6^{37} 7^{28} 8^{29} 9^{5} 10^{23} 10^{24} 10^{51} 11^{14} 12^{35} etc.

(19) Mk 15^{15}. D's omission of 'wishing to satisfy the crowd' is the precise instance taken by Lagrange (p. 37 f.) to illustrate omissions intended to harmonize one Gospel with another. D is supported by k ff ^{2} r. This 'Latinism' was naturally avoided by Matthew and Luke independently and is not in Tatian $^{ar.}$ (Hill, p. 243).

(20) Mk 15^{24}. D omits τις τι αρη but has επ αυτα after βαλλοντες κληρον: if Matthew and Luke followed D, they would probably have written επ αυτα too, but they remembered Ps 21 (22)^{19} ἔβαλον κλῆρον (cf. (5) above). Tatian $^{ar.}$ used Jn 19^{23} (Hill, p. 247).

To his remaining instances Mr. Glasson attaches less significance, as they illustrate agreement only between the Marcan D and Matthew against Mark.

(21) Mk 3^{35}. D and Matthew have μου before αδελφος instead of after it: W agrees with D (from Mk 1^{1}–5^{30} W is 'Western'): b has mihi frater, d ff meus frater. Here d may have influenced D again cf. (12).

(22) Mk 4^{11}. 'All things are *done* in parables' suggests the obvious and easy variant 'spoken' found in D Θ Σ and many Cæsarean minuscules; dicitur, b c ff g ^{1} i r ^{1} Cop ^{sa}, dicuntur a.q., dicere Geo. Tatian followed Mt 13^{12ff} (καλω) (Hill, p. 108).

(23) Mk 5^{1}. D and Matthew have εις το περαν without της θαλασσης: D is supported by b ff ^{2} i q r 1689 13.69. 543: d i q r actually read ultra, which may have affected D ^{Gk}. In any case, εις το περαν was a common Marcan phrase meaning the same thing, cf. Mk 4^{35} 5^{21} 6^{45} 8^{13}.

(24) Mk 6^{44}. D omits 'the loaves'; these words are naturally omitted in Matthew and are unnecessary in the Marcan context: Tatian followed Matthew (Hill, p. 117).

(25) Mk 6^{47}. D and some Cæsarean MSS. (P^{45} fam.^{1} 28) read παλαι whereas Matthew reads ηδη: d in Mark, iam erat. Tatian, apparently following Matthew had 'And the boat was many furlongs distant from the land' (Hill, p. 117), cf. Syr $^{c.p.}$, Jn 6^{19}. Some note of time or place was felt necessary to supplement Mark's narrative.

(26) Mk 6^{53} *om.* 'and moored to the shore,' D W Θ and Cæsarean minuscules, a b c ff i q r ^{1} Syr $^{s.\ pesh.}$ Geo. Arm. Tatian $^{ar.}$ 'And straightway the boat arrived at the land, to which they were going. And when they were come out of the boat' etc. (51^{b}), Tatian omitting the reference to the mooring and to Gennesareth, and rearranging the verses (Hill, p. 118).

(27) Mk 8^{4} 'here in a desert place.' D Θ 517, 1342 and some it. omit 'here,' which is displaced in other texts. Tatian, following Matthew, omits it (Hill, p. 134).

(28) Mk 10^{6}. D omits κτισεως and adds και ειπεν. The omission is an assimilation of Mark to Gn 1^{27} (not of Matthew to a Marcan D). Tatian follows Matthew here (Hill, p. 144) without κτισεως and with 'and he said.'

(29) Mk 10^{7}. The best text of Alexandria (א B Ψ 892) and of Antioch (Syr ^{s}) omitted προσκολληθησεται προς την γυναικα αυτου. But the assimilation to the Old Testament was rife in other MSS., including D, as in Matthew, cf. Gn 2^{24}

וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ.

(30) Mk 11^{23}. D with א Θ fam.^{13} 543, 28 etc. a b d i r ^{1} Syr ^{s} Geo. Arm. makes 'Have faith in God' a conditional clause with ει, the main clause being the next verse. Matthew has εαν εχητε πιστιν . . . Tatian certainly used a conditional clause: Tat. $^{ar.}$ 'Let the faith of God be in you. Verily I say unto ye, if ye shall believe . . .' (Hill, p. 174); Tat. $^{Ephr.}$ 'Ye also, if ye have faith . . .' (Hill, p. 363).

(31) Mk 13^{19}. D Θ 27, 565, a c ff i k n r ^{1} Arm. like Matthew omit 'which God created.' Tatian followed Matthew and omitted (Hill, p. 211). The omission is an assimilation to Dn 12^{1} cf. (29).

(32) Mk 14^{3}. D alone omits ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους but the words are attested by Tat. $^{ar.}$. 'A case of ointment of the best nard very costly' (Hill, p. 197). Matthew omits the difficult phrase ναρδου πιστικης (with 248 Syr $^{p.\ (\text{א MS.})}$). If Matthew really followed the Marcan D text, we should not have had even Matthew's πολυτιμου.

(33) Mk 14^{12} οι μαθηται αυτου.
D like Matthew omits αυτου, with 1542 lat $^{pler.}$ Arm. The omission is not at all significant.

(34) Mk 14^{30}. D and Mt 26^{34} omit δις in connexion with the cock-crowing. This omission is found in א* C D W 579, 1689 a b c ff ^{2} Arm. cf. Lagrange (*op. cit.*, 56). 'D om. η δις (κ), avant que le coq n'ait chanté "deux fois," parce que d'après les trois autres le chant du coq qui suit les trois reniements semble être le premier. Mais dans Mc xiv. 67 et 72, D a cependant

laissé subsister le premier chant du coq et souligné le second.—Tatien a ces deux mots' (cf. Hill, pp. 224 and 238).

(35) Mk 14[71] om. τουτον D 118, 1207 r[2] (om. τουτον ον λεγετε ℵ 544, 1588). Ta.[ar.] agrees with Mark (Hill, p. 238). The omission of τουτον by homoioteleuton would have been easy.

(36) Mk 15[12], D W Γ κ Cop[bo] and several minuscules omit παλιν 'a slight and unemphatic particle' in Mark, as Professor R. H. Lightfoot has described it, repeatedly omitted by Matthew and Luke. Tatian followed Matthew and omitted it (Hill, p. 242).

(37) Mk 16[6] ιδε ο τοπος οπου.
D ιδετε εκει τοπον αυτου οπου.
Mt 28[6] ιδετε τον τοπον οπου.
Under the influence of d, D had written αυτοις instead of αυταις: conscious of the plural, the scribe changed ιδε to ιδετε: ιδετε εκει W D 565 can hardly be derived from the videte ecce (!) of ff n q but may have come in from the variant reading of the verb εκειτο (for εθηκαν αυτον) found in (Ta) k ff[2] n q Syr[s.p.]. The accusative τοπον after ιδετε would be natural.

However, to repeat, the 'Western' revision was an early one and no doubt, sometimes contains genuine readings lost in other texts. *E.g.* Mk 1[41], in place of σπλαγχνισθεις, Tatian D a ff[2] r support οργισθεις. The former seems the easier reading and so inferior: Matthew and Luke, though following Mark at this point, give no participle at all, which suggests that σπλαγχνισθεις did not stand in their texts of Mark: it would be most unlike Luke at least, to omit any reference to our Lord's tenderness and it would be characteristic of both Matthew and Luke to suppress all mention of a human passion in Him, such as anger. In *v.*[43] there is some other 'Western' evidence for the omission of the entire verse with its singular word εμβριμησαμενος (W b c). Lagrange (p. 59) commented on *v.*[41], 'leçon qui a paru plus conforme à εμβριμησαμενος du *v.*[43]'; similarly Hort (*Select Notes*, 23) calls οργισθεις a singular reading perhaps derived from an extraneous source. E. Nestle (*Philologia Sacra*, 26) following Michaelis suggested that either οργη, οργιζεσθαι can have another meaning in Biblical than the classical sense or we have here a difference of translation. He suggested that רעם was used not only for βροντᾶν but also for σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, στέργειν and συμπάθειν, while אתרעם stood for χαλεπαίνειν, ἀγανάκτειν, γογγύζειν. Indeed Syr[s] would make this suggestion appear plausible as in *v.*[41] it uses ܪܚܡ. K. Lake's suggestion (*H.T.R.*, xvi. [1923], 197 f.) is not plausible, that a new punctuation is required and that the words, 'And he put out his hand in a passion of rage and touched him' refer to the leper not to the Lord: but he noted that the reference in von Soden's apparatus to οργισθεις as occurring in Tat.[Ephr.] seems to be due to a mistake, the language of Ephraem being fully accounted for by εμβριμησαμενος without implying that the Diatessaron read οργισθεις for σπλαγχνισθεις; however, J. Rendel Harris (*Expositor*, Oct. 1922, pp. 259 ff.) was probably right in his conclusion that Ephraem was thinking of both οργισθεις and εμβριμησαμενος, though he was probably wrong in suggesting that a Latin, not a Syriac word, 'motus' underlay the translation of οργισθεις and σπλαγχνισθεις.

Every instance of agreement between the text of D and Matthew and Luke against Mark must be weighed on its merits and account must be taken of the great influence on the 'separate Gospels' of those copies of the Diatessaron which circulated probably in bilingual form till Rabbula and Theodoret succeeded all too well in suppressing them, but which influenced even the late Pepysian Gospel Harmony in the West and the Gospel texts of Aphraates and of the translators of the Armenian New Testament in the East.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

St. Paul in the Boxing Ring.

By the Reverend Philip W. Lilley, M.A., Rhu.

'I am a boxer who does not inflict blows on the air, but I hit hard and straight at my own body.'—1 Co 9^{26} (Weymouth).

The other night I was at a huge boxing tournament and witnessed many bouts. One of the displays was given by two boys who boxed with consummate grace and skill. Some day I hope these fine lads will be able to use their strength, if need be, to defend the weak and defenceless and to deal with the bully in the only way in which he can be dealt with.

Now, Paul makes an astonishing statement in our text, when he says, 'I am a boxer.' One simply can't imagine Paul in the boxing-ring. He was far from robust. He tells us himself that he was not much to look at, he was, in fact, rather contemptible in appearance. What then does he mean when he says that he is a boxer? I think he was trying to help these Corinthians to be more hardy and less self-indulgent by giving them a picture of something with which they were very familiar. Great games were held at Corinth called the Isthmian Games, and Paul here refers to something he noticed when he was looking on at the boxing matches. He noticed this, in particular, that some of these boxers wasted a good deal of energy by swinging their arms about wildly in the air and effecting nothing.

He makes it clear, of course, that he is referring to the bigger contest of life, and that there is one person upon whom he must keep his eye, namely himself. He says quite plainly, 'I do not plant my blows upon the empty air, but—and this is the arresting thing—I hit hard and straight at my own body.' In other words, he is up against himself. His body, at least, was a tough adversary, and when he says, 'No, I maul and master my body,' he uses a word which every Greek boxer knew and employed to express a merciless blow on the face. Why was he so hard on himself, you may ask me? The answer is quite simple. He had found that his body instead of being the servant of his desires was becoming a tyrant or dictator and that his best self was slipping slowly into servitude. He felt naturally that that was a state of things that simply could not be allowed to go on. So he firmly resolved to put a stop to it. He had to give his body a very hard punch from time to time just to show it that he was, so to speak, 'master in his own house.'

You boys and girls have simply got to be boxers like the Apostle. We have to wake up to the fact, and the earlier the better, that our bodies are often difficult to manage and rebellious. They are therefore a dangerous possession, if they tend to make us lazy or selfish or greedy. If we allow our body to dictate to our spirit, we become soft and slack and selfish instead of eager and alert and keen to serve. These are the temptations which meet every one of us in the great arena of life and if we want to conquer them, we must hit them hard and straight and not just beat the air in a half-hearted sort of way.

So we must get into training very early in life, as the Greeks did when they prepared for the Isthmian games, and as St. Paul did all his days. For life is a great contest. Plato, a Greek philosopher, wrote long ago: 'For great is the contest, great, but not as great as it seems, whether a man is to be good or evil.' We hear a great deal nowadays about 'targets.' Wouldn't it be well to take ourselves now and again as *the* target, and because of that difficult target to 'shoot up' all those things that prevent us being at our very best. As a bomber pilot said the other day, 'Unless I get a direct hit, a thousand mile trip is all in vain.' You have a much longer way to go than that, so see to it that you win the victory over yourself as in Christ's strength you will.

The Flying Bomb.

By the Reverend George B. Anderson, M.A., Maybole, Ayrshire.

'Devise not evil.'—Pr 3^{29}.

Shortly after our invasion of Europe, Germany sent against us what we have called the 'flying bomb.' More strictly it is a pilotless aeroplane carrying a load of high explosive. Launched from the French coast, it has a range of 150 miles and can do extensive damage at no cost to enemy personnel. Almost eight thousand flying bombs have now been launched against us.

This furnishes a telling illustration of how evil works:

1. Once launched, the bomb must fly its appointed course. There is no further control over it; it cannot be arrested half-way and brought back. Evil is like that. Once released it runs its course. The wicked word, for example, once uttered just flies on, There is no hope of recalling it. It may go all round the town and do great damage before it has finally spent its force. And usually, too, the person who launches that bit of wickedness remains immune. The devil takes good care that he does not suffer from the effects of his own actions.

2. The flying bomb has no special target. It does not matter where it lands. The Germans just aim it generally at us; it is sufficient if it falls somewhere in England. It cannot be sufficiently controlled to be directed against a definite military objective. Thus, much indiscriminate damage and suffering are caused. Evil is like that. It does not care who suffers. The thief does not steal from the rich to help the poor but steals wherever possible. The cheat cheats right and left. The selfish person does not care who goes without, provided he himself is satisfied. Wickedness is neither

bridled nor controlled. Too often the innocent suffer with the guilty.

3. The only way to conquer the menace of the flying bomb is to shoot it down or to destroy it at its base. Evil must be so treated too.

Shoot it down. If you see wickedness growing and can stop it, check it, or arrest its course, do so! The evil word—don't you send it any farther; shoot it down. The evil action—don't you continue it; stop it, shoot it down. But this can't account for all the missiles. Many get through.

So we must destroy them at their source. Don't you be an agent of the devil. Don't you start evil or launch any wickedness on its way. Oppose evil at the outset. The launching sites of evil are our tendencies to sin. The attack must be against these. Our sins must be conquered and our hearts made pure. Wickedness is defeated and evil is vanquished only as we become better men, and by Christ's help we can become even better than we had supposed.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

On Seeing a Word Home.

'We will hear thee again of this matter. Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed.'—Ac $17^{32\text{-}34}$.

No speaker worth the name was ever indifferent to the effect of his message. Jesus Christ was no exception to the rule. He studied the reactions of His audience with wistful solicitude. In the Parable of the Sower we see Him reckoning, with grave concern, the chances of the seed sown in human hearts.

The same was true of the great Apostle. There was a day when he took his stand on Mars Hill, in the glamorous city of Athens, and preached the gospel. In accordance with his own practice of being 'all things to all men,' that he might win some, he tried to gain a hearing for his message by showing his audience that he was at home in their own thinking. For a while they gave him their attention, but when he came to the story of the Resurrection they separated into three groups. Some mocked. Some delayed—saying, 'We will hear thee again of this matter. Howbeit certain men clave unto him and believed.'

Some mocked. There will always be those who hear the gospel—and smile. It is worth while considering the various forms of this mockery in the heart of man. Its earliest is the light, airy mockery of youth, the untimely cynicism of inexperience. Jesus has not only described it for us but has shown us the Nemesis which attends it. In the greatest short story in the world He shows us a youth leaving home, glad to be quit of its restraints and prohibitions, and eager to do what he likes with body, mind, and soul, only to find, like so many more, that to be free to do what we like is less a matter for exultation than for fear and trembling. Well, we have the experiment described for us—and its ending. When he comes home there is no more mockery.

Then there is always with us the disdain of dishonest doubt. We say, advisedly, dishonest doubt, for it is always the mark of the sincere doubter that he never sneers. If the religion of Jesus is not what it claims to be, but a beautiful delusion, if all that Christians have lived and died for is a falsehood, if our churches and cathedrals are built on the sands of superstition, then it is a tragedy too deep for tears, not a matter for shallow mockery.

Again, there is the superciliousness of the man who has got on in life, and for whom religion is a negligible factor in the world of his success. Of this type the Bible speaks with peculiar austerity. It says of him, 'God is not in all his thoughts.'

Lastly, there is the hard, cynical mockery of the man who has taken to evil courses and, for a time at least, 'gets away with it.' The wicked hath said in his heart, 'I shall never be moved.' From such a spiritual torpor, the hardening of the heart that comes to him who says, 'Evil, be thou my good,' the awakening is sometimes rude. Just when he is safest, the blow falls.

That prince of short story tellers, the American writer O. Henry, has a tale entitled 'The Assessor of Success.' A man sits smoking a large cigar in a New York city park as the evening is falling. He is filled with a great content with himself and the world. He is an expert thief. He has had a great day and, at eventide, he is living it all over again. But the day is not yet over. 'The clock struck nine as a girl, just entering womanhood, stopped at the corner, waiting for a car. She was hurrying homeward, as if from employment or delay. Her eyes were clear and pure. She was dressed in simple white. He knew her. Eight years before, he had sat on the same bench with her at school. There had been no sentiment, nothing but the friendship of innocent days. But he turned down a side street and laid his suddenly burning face against the cool iron of a lamp-post, and said, dully, "God, I wish I could die."'

But besides those who mocked as they heard the Apostle that day there was a group who were not scornful. *They simply postponed a decision.* You remember that the trial of Warren Hastings lasted eight long years. Year after year passed in sifting evidence before a verdict was pronounced. There are people who are under the delusion that you can treat religion like that. They pride themselves on 'keeping an open mind on these matters.' G. K. Chesterton has a word for such triflers, for triflers they are, at heart. He says: 'Merely having an open mind is nothing. The object of opening the mind, as of opening the mouth, is to shut it again on something solid.' Life calls for decision, and if we will not decide, life decides for us. Even doing nothing at all is—to decide. It is to be carried with the stream. In a world like this 'we theorize with a pistol at our head.' Whatever intellectual difficulties a man may have, he knows that, in his life, there are certain far more urgent things calling for settlement. There is the surge of passion in his nature, the onset of temptation, how to bear oneself in the calamities and sorrows that beset us all—just those experiences in life

where Christ comes to us, offering a working, honourable solution. But if a man imagines that he can keep the Son of God, for an indefinite time, knocking at the door of his heart, he may find that he has presumed too far on that loveliest of texts. The sincere and generous heart of youth, before the cold, dead hand of worldly prudence is laid upon it, responds instinctively to the appeal of Jesus for its best years—and that chivalrously and without dishonest delay. It sings :

O not for Thee my weak desires,
My poorer, baser part !
O not for Thee my fading fires,
The ashes of my heart !

O choose me in my golden time :
In my dear joys have part !
For Thee the glory of my prime,
The fulness of my heart !

Lastly, there were those listening to Paul that day who gave his message *their whole-hearted acceptance*. Note the very suggestive way in which their surrender is described : 'They clave unto him and believed,' *not* 'They believed and clave unto him,' as one might have expected. It was the man, more than the message, that captured them.

Here is a great principle, applicable not only to preachers, but to all who would influence others in the way of Christ. What we are, in a thousand subtle ways prevails over what we say. This has been noted in the case of two great men, Whately and Newman, who were contemporaries in Oriel Common Room in Oxford. 'Whately required to bring to the mind of his listeners the clearest intellectual demonstration before he could lead them, whereas they were moved by anything Newman said, from the mere fact that it was he who said it.' Or, to take another example of this spiritual phenomenon, one would be strangely made if one were not moved to holy envy by the lines addressed to a saintly and scholarly London preacher by one of his congregation :

For me 'twas not the truth you taught,
For you so clear, to me so dim,
But, when you came, you brought
A sense of Him.

And from your eyes, He beckons me,
And from your heart, His love is shed,
Till I lose sight of you—and see
The Christ instead.

The law holds, not for the preacher only, but for all who seek to shed a Christian influence on their fellow-men. Every time we go into the secret place and, in lowly contrition and austere sincerity, ask God to purge us of all conscious unreality and worldliness and to put within us His spirit of lowliness and love and service, we are laying up within us stores of blessing and power, on which many, whom we may never know, will draw in their hour of sorrow and temptation.[1]

[1] C. J. Jeffrey, *Christian Intimacies*, 93.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

'Browned Off.'

BY THE REVEREND FRANK W. MOYLE, M.A.,
ALLESLEY RECTORY, COVENTRY.

'And because it had no root, it withered away.'—Mk 4^{6}.

'I joined the Air Force to see the world, and here I've been stuck in this out-of-the-way place for two years : I'm feeling properly browned off !'

This tells of a characteristic modern mood. Most of us are at times susceptible to it and in normal times we used to rely on a holiday to get ourselves renewed, but in wartime many have found themselves driven to a deeper discovery. We find that the renewing, reviving, re-creating, refreshing forces are to be found not in our environment but deep down in our own souls.

Recognized in Scripture. The 'browned off' mood is something that attacks the soul. People have been familiar with it in every age. The Biblical writers knew all about it. 'Thy life shall hang in doubt before thee . . . and thou shalt have none assurance of thy life : In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even ! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning !' The disillusioned writer of Ecclesiastes seems to have lived permanently in it. 'All things are full of weariness ; man cannot utter it : the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing . . .'

As long as we are in that mood no truth can find a home in our minds, no beauty can thrill us, no goodness can take root in our lives. The great sower may drop his seed, but as our Lord Himself observed we are like rocky ground where there is no depth of soil : 'And when the sun was risen, it was scorched ; and because it had no root, it withered away.' In fact it just got 'browned off.'

Is there a Cure ? Now, is there anything to be done about it ?

Again, since the Biblical writers recognize it, let us see whether they can prescribe the cure. We instinctively turn to one who lived in times of great international and national crisis, a time when 'the fruitful field was a wilderness and all the cities were broken down' and we find the wisest man of that generation, the prophet Jeremiah. He says that the remedy is to go back to Nature and learn. 'The life you are living is not the true life of man ; it is not natural. Just go and look at a tree and see whether that tree doesn't know a secret which you have somehow lost. You need to be more like that.' For the tree to which Jeremiah pointed was the date palm. This tree will grow in any soil but it will never bear any fruit unless it is near water. Observe that, consider that, and then you will be 'as a tree planted by the waters, that spreadeth out his roots by the river, and shall not fear when heat cometh, but his leaf shall be green ; and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit.'

But How ? But how are we to do this thing which the date palm does ?

'If thou wouldst be perfect,' said the German

poet, Schiller, 'Go look upon a flower, and what that does willesly that do thou willingly.' We must overcome our unwillingness to deepen our lives. There is something in us which draws back. It may be our pride which makes us unwilling to admit that we have been stupid in neglecting our prayer life. It may be our fear of what it may mean if we face God in our inner chamber and behind that shut door. It may be our dislike of what others may say when they perceive that we have 'gone religious.' Whatever it is, that thing which draws us back must be withdrawn.

We must spread out our roots by the river. That was a favourite way of Jeremiah's in thinking about God. He speaks in his private note-book (surely so often incorporated in his writings) of God as 'the fountain of living waters.' Like the date palm we are planted by the river. It is very near us. God the great reality is very near us. It is not far that we have to stretch to reach the river. Our Lord brought it nearer still, for He says, 'The water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life.' So what we have to do when we have overcome our unwillingness is to find God, as the tree finds the river, in the depths of our own personality.

In reply to that I can hear another criticism: 'It's the same old story. You're just repeating the old slogan, "Come to church more often."' For answer we can return to the prophet Jeremiah. He lived not only in a day of trouble but also in a day when one of the greatest reformations of organized religion that has ever happened was going on. The reforms advocated by the great prophets from Amos to Isaiah were being codified in a book of Laws (The Book of Deuteronomy) published in the year 621 B.C. The whole emphasis of that book is to be found, not in the order to attend public worship (although it does command it three times a year in the Temple at Jerusalem), but in a call to the people to deepen their inner ives: 'The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.'

Jeremiah himself warned his hearers that they must not deceive themselves into thinking that mere attendance at public worship would solve their personal problems. 'Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, are these.'

And so we reply: Church services may help you to do this personal thing but if you let yourself think that by merely attending them you are really deepening your spiritual life you may be deceiving yourself.

The tree planted by the river can't get any other tree to spread out its roots for it. The most helpful Church service can't do for you what only you can do for yourself. You must get right through to God yourself. 'Enter into thine inner chamber, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.'

We must learn to accept a mood such as we have been considering as a direct challenge to a deeper way of prayer. We have assumed too often that God is a being outside us. He is. But the deeper truth which we need is that 'In him we live, and move, and have our being.'

It is one thing to stand on the seashore and enjoy a sea breeze. It's another thing to plunge in and swim out into the deep refreshing water. 'God,' says Lady Julian of Norwich, 'God is nearer to us than our own soul: for He is the ground in whom our soul standeth . . . For our soul sitteth in God in very rest, and our soul standeth in God in very strength, and our soul is kindly rooted in God in endless love; And therefore if we will have knowledge of our soul, and communing and dalliance therewith, it behoveth to seek unto our Lord God in whom it is enclosed.'

SUNDAY BEFORE ADVENT.

When the Lights Go Up.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'Then he called for a light.'—Ac 16[29].

About ten o'clock on Wednesday night, November 13th, 1918, I was passing through the ancient and sacred streets of Philippi, when, in the brilliant moonlight, I saw the sharp outline of a steep hill. In New Testament times there used to be a Roman citadel on that hill. On the slopes of the hill there was a prison, and, cut into the rock beneath, were the cells. Up above was the governor's private house. I want to tell you what happened on that hill some two thousand years ago.

It is late in the night. The prison governor has finished his tour of inspection. The warders have reported all correct. The governor has all the keys of every cell. He knows the name and number of every prisoner. There is no mystery at all about that well-run institution. The system runs like a well-oiled machine. And so the governor goes to his rest. But, for all that, that prison governor is not safe. He is not safe there any more than any man is safe anywhere. He is not safe simply because he is a man. And then, suddenly, the unexpected happens. There is a crash and a commotion and all the lights go out. He rushes down through the darkness and confusion into the prison below and—'*then* he called for a light.'

(1) And here comes the difference between a man and all the rest of God's creatures.

The animals—they go their rounds from day to day. They obey their impulses. They fit perfectly into their surroundings. They have no questions to ask, no problems to solve:

They do not sweat and whine about their condition,
They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins,
They do not make me sick discussing their duty to God,
Not one is dissatisfied.

They have all the light they need, even in the dark.

But a man? There is Tennyson. He spent his life calling for light:

> There on the border
> Of boundless Ocean,
> And all but in Heaven,
> Hovers The Gleam.

And on the day he died, he said to his son: 'I want the blinds up. I want to see the sky, and the light.'

That has been the story of man all along, and still is—calling for light. 'Three-fourths of life is impenetrable darkness.' And then we light our lamps. The lamps of the sciences—What is the meaning of this, that, and the other? The lamp of philosophy—What is the meaning of it all? The lamp of spiritualism—What is there on the other side of death? And so on. It is the story of the lighting of the lamps to try to penetrate the gloom.

But, surely, people do have enough light to carry on from day to day, to do this and to go there. A man may have all the details of his daily job at his fingers' ends . . . But nobody is safe. Sooner or later comes the reminder that we all live on the edge of the unexplored. Some business disaster, some personal sorrow, the stab or throb of some unconquered sin, a sudden fear—the fear of growing old, of falling ill, of becoming poor. And the fear of death. Soon or late every man's life narrows down to this: '*then* he called for a light.'

(2) Let us go back to the Philippian jailor. We left him in his room. He has finished his day's work. It is all correct. He is on top of his job. He is, indeed, quite literally. But there is one thing that he never guessed. He did not know that underneath the very foundations of his own house there were the seeds of disquiet. Under the very room where he was taking his rest there were the elements of unrest, there stirred the most ancient of all forms of human injustice, the suffering of innocent men. Listen for a moment to what is going on down there in the cells: 'And at midnight Paul and Silas (their feet made fast in the stocks) prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them.'

And then it came! The Unexpected. The one shattering experience of this man's life, as come it must, in some shape or form, to all of us—the thing that puts all the lights out. The earthquake. He rushed down through the darkness and confusion and—'*then* he called for a light.' He called better than he knew. He fell at the feet of Paul and Silas and cried: 'Sirs, what must I do to be saved?' Swift as light itself came the answer: 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.' For this man, the lights have gone up.

(3) The way through life has been compared to a walk down a street by night. The street is lighted by a long row of lamps, and if the lamps are all lighted, or even if some of them are lighted, one has enough light to find one's way about. There is the lamp of reason, of intuition, of common sense, of custom. There is the lamp of the latest book, of the daily newspaper, of the radio. And a very good light they give when the going is good. But the brightest of them are, after all, only street lamps lighted by ourselves. There comes a puff of wind, the wind of some sorrow, the gale of some disaster, the gust of some sudden temptation and blows them out one by one until we are left in the dark.

How much light do our little street lamps give in the Valley of the Shadow of Death? Where are the dead? Ask human speculation, or research, or intuition. Where are the dead? I do not know where they are. How should I know? How can any man know? Unless God lights the lamp, we are all in the dark here. But God has! The Incarnation—God in Christ coming down into our darkness! The Cross—God in Christ going down into our death. The Resurrection—God lighting the Lamps! 'Because I live, therefore ye shall live also.' God has turned on the Light.

How much light do our little street lamps give in the Valley of Humiliation? When my sins are so many and so great and I reach the point when I have sinned my will away. When I have disappointed and broken the hearts of those who have loved and trusted me. Unless God lights the lamp, we are all in the dark here. But God has! 'Then he called for a light.' And, swift as light itself, came the answer. 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.'

'*Then*—he called for a light.' Yes, *then*, in the midst of some great convulsion that blows out all our little lamps. And for our stricken and shattered world that *then* has come *now*. Only the God-kindled Light can show us the way now.

> When we in darkness walk,
> And stumble through the night,
> *Then* is the time to trust in God
> And turn towards the Light!

First Sunday in Advent.

The Mark of Messiahship.

By the Reverend Harold Derbyshire, Harrogate.

'Jesus of Nazareth . . . who went about doing good.'—Ac 10[38].

The very simplicity of these words may possibly cause us to overlook the wonder of them. It may seem such a little thing to have been said of One who was pointed out as the Son of God: 'He went about doing good.'

Think of words like these being applied to some of the men whom the world has accounted great; your Alexanders, your Cæsars, your Napoleons, or your Hitlers. . . . Why, such a tribute would have been disdained by these 'great ones,' and it would not have been offered by any of their flatterers. Its strangeness would be very evident nineteen centuries ago, but whether men like it or not, Christ has changed our standards of greatness. When He said to His disciples, 'Whosoever would be great among you, let him be your servant,' He was revolutionizing their ideas on the subject. But the revolution was made more

complete by what He did than by anything He said.

It is not only political and military leaders who might have disdained such a notion of greatness. Many of the founders of religious faiths, their priests and prophets, would hardly have been singled out for a tribute of this kind. We may find it difficult to realize that at one time religion itself was not concerned primarily with 'doing good'; but you have only to glance at some of the non-Christian religions of to-day to see the difference that Christ makes. Religions have often been concerned chiefly with magical rites, with the appeasement of evil spirits, sometimes by means of the sacrifice of animals or of human beings. Their witch doctors or high priests have not been usually regarded as men who 'went about doing good.' They are more often associated with working evil, from which it is necessary to buy them off.

Even among His own people, with their loftier thoughts of God, Jesus was not the sort of Messiah that most men expected to see. Many Jews looked for a Deliverer after the fashion of the second Psalm: 'Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.' They were amazed at His works of mercy; at His healing of sick folk, His tenderness towards the unfortunate, His compassion for the poor and the sinful.

It was strange, incredible, that God's messenger should be one like this; just a Man who 'went about doing good.' And yet, although some were offended by the manner of His coming, in the long run it was this that won men and women to Jesus, and brought victory to His cause. Here, in the words of our text, we have Peter, speaking to Gentiles, commending His Master to the wider world of men as One 'who went about doing good.'

And, despite many failures and weaknesses, the Christian Church throughout the ages has recognized this as the distinguishing mark of the true disciple. We find Christians derided by proud Romans as gathering around them the slaves, the poor, the outcast; but that was their glory, even as it was their Lord's that He should have been called 'friend of publicans and sinners.' About the middle of the third century, a certain deacon named Laurentius, when ordered, during a time of persecution, to hand over the treasures of the Church, pointed to the poor as her only treasures. 'This,' says Harnack, 'was audacious, but it was not incorrect.'

It was Christians who founded hospitals. Our first English hospital, St. Bartholomew's, was established in the twelfth century by Rahere, a court jester who became a monk. When you think of the great abbeys and monasteries of this land, do not imagine that these buildings sheltered men who lived an idle life, or even one purely of quietness and contemplation. That is very far from the whole truth. These monks were renowned for their good works; they cured disease, they dispensed charity, they provided means of education when there were no other schools.

It was Christians like John Howard and Elizabeth Fry who brought about the reform of prisons, who, like Clarkson and Woolman and Wilberforce, struck at the root of slavery. If true peace is to be established in our time, Christians must be its makers.

This practice of 'going about doing good' wins a way into men's hearts as nothing else will. More than any other body of disciples, probably, we associate the Society of Friends, the Quakers, with consistency in this matter. In spite of the smallness of their numbers, how powerful has been their influence! The secret has been and still is found in the silent witness of their lives, in the sheer goodness of character that expresses itself in acts of mercy and kindness. Such deeds have power to prevail over all prejudice, to break down misunderstanding.

Think of two out of the many well-known Christians of this generation.

There was the Englishman, 'Grenfell of Labrador.' A young medical student, with the prospect of a fine career before him, he hears the call of Christ, and feels that it is leading him away from a lucrative practice in Harley Street to service with the North Sea fishing fleet. After sharing the hardships of the deep sea fishermen for a year or two, a call comes to minister where the needs are even greater; along the frozen coasts of Labrador. He crosses the Atlantic, to face the loneliness and perils of an inhospitable land. For over forty years he laboured there, and by the sheer impact of a Christ-dedicated life he transformed the lives of the people of that desolate place. He founded schools, orphanages, hospitals, co-operative societies, new industries, and forms of agriculture, but, most of all, he gave men hope instead of despair by sharing with them his own radiant experience of Christ.

Then there is that remarkable man who has been called the St. Francis of Japan, Kagawa, who surrendered the chance of a life of wealth and pleasure in order to become a disciple of Christ, and who, in his early twenties, plunged himself into one of the worst of his country's slums, dwelling in the midst of unspeakable squalor, filth, disease, and wickedness, so that he might give Christ to the outlaws of society. The story of how, despite a stricken body of which physicians have despaired, he has been able to carry on his work to this day, being in turn evangelist, novelist, social reformer, labour leader, is the record of one of the miracles of faith.

So Peter's instinct was right when he singled out as a most significant feature of his Master's life that He 'went about doing good,' for whenever men have tried to follow in His steps they have been found doing the same. But don't let us think that to be a Christian therefore means simply that we should be what people call a 'humanitarian'—whatever precisely that may mean. The Scribes and Pharisees tried to be that, but Jesus said to His disciples, 'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter

into the kingdom of Heaven.' They thought that to perform a certain round of charitable works, almsgiving and the like, would earn them a reward from God, and we know how empty and unfruitful works done in this spirit can be.

The good deeds of the Christian spring naturally from a heart of love; he does good because he cannot help it. Peter, in this address to Cornelius and his friends, after saying that Jesus 'went about doing good,' adds, as if by way of explanation, 'for God was with him.' That is the whole secret of the matter. We cannot do good in the right spirit, to have any fruitful outcome, except God be with us. We are sadly insufficient of ourselves, and our resources pitifully meagre, but God can give the grace we require to do these things. Astronomers have told us how tiny a fraction of the rays sent out by the sun fall on this world. Of all the light and heat which it pours out, our earth takes no more in comparison than a sip taken from a lake by a swallow that skims its surface. So our largest petitions can never strain the resources of God. Let us therefore pray that this mind may be in us, which was also in Christ Jesus.

During the next few years what a stupendous need there will be throughout the world for the exercise of the spirit of Christ! Many peoples will be suffering from famine and disease, and many from despair. Bitterness and hatred and other foul legacies of war will be destroying men's hearts. Something much more than material supplies will be needed. Understanding, sympathy, Christian love, will be required, and they can only be offered by disciples of Jesus who will go forth in no superior or patronizing way, but bravely and humbly, sharing a common penitence for the sins of the world.

Sincere and sacrificial service like this could change the whole outlook of this generation. It is hard for us perhaps to believe in such a possibility, but, because God can make such people, there is hope for the future. Let Him begin with you and me.

Dante on the Winning of the Peace.

By the Reverend John D. Sinclair, B.D., Edinburgh.

In recent discussions of the post-war world and the winning of the peace I have seen no reference to the imagery in which, more than six centuries ago, Dante set forth what he conceived to be the imperative conditions of a just order of the world. It is an imagery which is apt to strike us at first glance as laboured and cumbrous, but which, in sum, is full of simple and fundamental meanings which set the eighteenth and following cantos of the *Paradiso* aflame with Dante's passion for righteousness and peace on earth.

In the *Paradiso* he tells of his passage through the heavens, which are pictured as successive spatial spheres surrounding the earth and each having its distinctive character, to the heaven of heavens, beyond all the spheres, where God is. The sun and moon and the five known planets, each in its own sphere, wheel about the earth at what were supposed to be their actual distances from the earth and from each other; and in each of these seven spheres Dante meets with a different company of the redeemed having its own distinctive quality of saintliness appropriate to its sphere. In the heaven of Mars he sees the martial spirits who have fought and given their lives in God's cause on earth and whose type is the Crusader; and from that he rises to the greater sphere of Jupiter, where he sees the rulers who have been distinguished in history for the justice of their rule. He passes, that is to say, from the virtues required in war to the greater virtues required in an ordered peace. It is, in prospect, our own case.

To this transition Dante gives a space and a salience in his poem which he does not give to any other such transition among the planetary heavens. His guide was Beatrice, and when he passed with her out of the red glow of Mars into the white serenity of Jupiter, 'I saw her eyes so clear, so joyful, that her aspect surpassed all it had been at other times, even the last. As from feeling more delight in welldoing a man is conscious day by day of his advance in virtue, so I was conscious, when I saw that miracle more fair, that my circling with the heavens had increased its arc; and such a change as passes in a moment over the face of a pale woman when she is freed from a burden of shame there was for my eyes, when I had turned, on account of the whiteness of the temperate sixth star, which had received us into itself.'

In the *Divine Comedy* Beatrice is both personal and sacramental for Dante, at once his old love and the truth of God, and her becoming 'more fair' in his eyes with each new ascent means his own ever fuller apprehension of the truth which she is and an ever nearer approach to the Beatific Vision. Here, he says, she surpassed in beauty all her former aspects, 'even the last,' even that in the imagined glory of Mars. For he is at pains

to show that public justice in peace, itself the cause for which the fighting saints have striven in war, is a greater and harder achievement than any victory; it demands a larger view of the world, and a deeper sense of providence, and a more disciplined mind and will; reaching it, the soul must move in a greater arc.

The souls in Jupiter, like those in the other heavens, are clothed and hidden in their own light, and they move to their appointed places like birds, singing as they fly. While Dante watches them they group themselves into the forms of letters which shine out successively—'five times seven vowels and consonants, and I noted them severally and what they seemed to me to mean'; so he describes his careful, and at first perplexed, observation of them. In the end the souls have spelled out the first words of the Book of Wisdom from the Vulgate: '*Diligite justitiam, qui judicatis terram*,' 'Love justice, ye that judge the earth.' Earthly justice, Dante would say, must, by its nature, be *spelled out* by its lovers, letter by letter, with trial and correction and approximation from age to age; and to love justice is to *be* just. The letters of these words of Scripture are formed of the just rulers themselves, of the very being and shining quality of their souls. For public justice is a spiritual thing, an attribute of the soul, existing so or not at all.

There follows an image which is stranger still, but, for Dante, inevitable and essential. On the last letter of the last word, the M in *terram*—as it were their final aim and goal,—the souls 'kept their order, so that Jupiter seemed there silver pricked out with gold'; and, with the accession of 'more than a thousand lights' besides, 'singing the good that draws them to itself,' the M was built up into the heraldic form of an eagle, 'the sign that made the Romans reverend to the world.' The M stands for *Monarchia*, Empire, one justice for all men. For the Roman Eagle meant for Dante the divinely appointed civil order of humanity, the justice of God realised in an earthly government, under which, as he had written in his *De Monarchia*, 'life, on this little threshing-floor of mortals, may be lived in freedom and in peace.'

Dante's conception of an Empire ruling a peaceful world from Rome was, even then, and especially after the defeat and death of his hero the Emperor Henry VII. in 1313, a dream wholly impossible of realization; and, with every allowance for history, it is still astonishing that such a man as Dante should ever have looked to the existing Empire for the fulfilment of his hopes. How much or how little he still cherished, when he wrote the *Paradiso*, of his expectation of an actual Roman Empire of the world, we cannot tell. But he knew and maintained with a constant loyalty that the true Empire which was to make peace among men was a pattern showed to him in the mount, an end to which all the best the just have ever lived for and the world has ever known of human order is but a distant approach and prophecy; and it is so he sets forth that dominating passion of his life.

The Eagle, made up of many 'congregated souls'—for Dante stresses their number and their diversity—speaks with a single voice and says '*I* and *mine* when its meaning is *me* and *ours*. Thus is felt a single glow from many brands, as from that image came forth a single sound of many loves.' In all the other planetary heavens individual souls speak with Dante; here none speaks but the Eagle, the imaged consensus and collaboration of all the just rulers in history and the achieved moral unity of the world, for which no one of them by himself may presume to speak.

It is in the presence of the Eagle that Dante cries out against the Church, then at its worst in Avignon, 'whence comes the smoke that dims the beam' of that 'sweet star' of justice; and it is the Eagle itself that tells of the chief contemporary rulers of Europe, warring, treacherous, oppressive, the report of whose doings forms, as it were inevitably, an acrostic of the word *lue*, pestilence—they are a plague on the world. For the Eagle, as Dante conceives it, is no mere human device and no accident of history. It is a 'divine image'; 'He that designs there has none to guide Him, but Himself guides,' just as He guides the birds in the designing of their nests; 'our justice' on earth 'is the effect of the heaven' of that 'sweet star'; these just souls are 'shining fires of the Holy Ghost,' and the Holy Ghost, in mediæval thought, is the love of God.

Dante's problem in a disordered world is not our problem to-day, nor can his solution serve our need. But he may still be our teacher of lessons which are at once lofty and severely practical and which, now as at no other time we have known, it is imperative that we should learn: that in face of the vast problems of world-order that now challenge us our need is primarily spiritual, it is our souls that are needy; that it is those who 'love justice,' and no others, that shall ever find it; that nothing is justice that is not just to all; and that our designs for a just order, at their best and utmost, are but parts and promises of a design which goes beyond our day and beyond our thought, a design in which 'He that designs has none to guide Him, but Himself guides,'

Contributions and Comments.

ἑτοιμασία in Ephesians vi. 15.

In his letter on σιώπησις in your February number, Mr. E. H. Blakeney passes on to make a suggestion regarding the meaning of ἑτοιμασία in Eph 6^{15}. His interesting question caused me to look up that thoughtful article on the subject in Vol. IX. (p. 38), where M. Buascarlet discusses at length the sense in which St. Paul uses the word.

It has always been matter of surprise to me that I have seen no subsequent reference to what he wrote, as I know no interpretation of the difficult ἑτοιμασία equally satisfying. He takes the view tentatively put forward by Mr. Blakeney, and I venture to suggest that a *résumé* of the original article of forty-six years ago might be of interest to your readers of to-day.

John A. F. Gregg, Archbishop.

The Palace, Armagh.

1 Timothy vi. 10.

The argument on 1 Ti 6^{10} remains deadlocked, even though the fashion of the day among commentators may swing the decision one way. On the one hand, it is true that no reader would have thought of understanding anything else than 'the root of all evils' if he had not felt a difficulty in accepting that. On the other hand, it seems equally true that if the author had wished to say 'a root of all evils' he would have been likely to write what he did.

And, finally, the difficulty in the sense is not a modern artificiality which could not have presented itself to the writer's mind. The words are not the legitimate hyperbole of a competent writer, but the recklessness of a careless man. 'The love of money is the root of all evils' would not have suggested itself to Paul or to any first-class moralist. The Apostle knew that laziness, drunkenness, unchastity, were evils, and that their tendency is rather to deplete the purse, so that avarice cannot lead one into them. He would have been very shallow if he had thought that because men may pray to an idol for money, may quarrel over money, may be proud of it, therefore the love of money is the root of all idolatry, all quarrelsomeness, all pride.

May not the words have been a current quotation, perhaps from a comedy? A comic dramatist could easily have coined the phrase, the more readily as a dramatist may put into the mouth of a character something which he would not have asserted as an article of his own philosophy. The phrase, reckless as it is, could easily have become a popular quotation, as in fact it has among us, who pervert it additionally by omitting 'the love of.' And the Apostle could have cited a familiar phrase with much less attention to its logical tenability than he would naturally have paid in coining a phrase of his own which should be completely suited to his purpose.

As to the idea of a metrical original, φιλαργυρία may not be a good word to end a line, and it may not be advisable to mend the meter by substituting the infinitive φιλαργυρεῖν. But we could have the last half of one senarius and the first half of another,

ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν
ἐσθ' ἡ φιλαργυρία.

Or we could assume that the words had been quoted with transposition, and that the original senarius had been φιλαργυρία ★ ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν, inserting in place of my star any post-positive monosyllabic particle that suits your taste.

Really, the words as they stand are quite favourable to the idea of an iambic or trochaic rhythm slightly deformed in quotation. 1 Co 15^{33} is a precedent for quoting a writer of the New Comedy without naming the source. Ac 17^{28}, with its changes of σοί to αὐτῷ and of the ending μεσθα to μεθα, is a precedent for quoting poetry with enough alteration to destroy the meter. 1 Ti 4^{4} is a precedent in this very epistle for the use of a familiar expression, notoriously derived from poetry, with total oblivion of metrical form.

Steven T. Byington.

Ballard Vale, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Jeremiah v. 28.

דִּין יָתוֹם וְיַצְלִיחוּ
וּמִשְׁפַּט אֶבְיוֹנִים לֹא שָׁפָטוּ׃

LXX omits וְיַצְלִיחוּ, but this would render the metre defective. I suggest reading יצלחו (which could be vocalized as Qal, Pi'el or Hiph'il) and recognizing a root צלה IV equivalent to Ethiopic ጸለሐ: 'deceive, defraud.' The sense will then be:

'In the case of the fatherless they cheat,
And mete out no justice to the poor.'

Theodor H. Gaster.

New York.

Is Christ Divided?

1 Corinthians i. 11 ff.

While many zealous Christians are endeavouring to construct a 'bridge' between the Established

Church of England and Rome, could not a greater and more sustained endeavour be made to build a 'bridge' to unite the Established Church and those of the Free Churches? It is argued that the diversity in Nature offers a proof that the present diversity of worship and service in the various churches may be quite correct and in accordance with the will and purpose of God. While this argument appears to be logical, in view of the tremendous importance of our witness and the special call for united effort on the battle front, would it not be well to think out, discuss thoroughly and pray earnestly and intelligently for divine direction as to a 'bridge' to bring us into close comradeship in our fight against our foe?

1. What are the barriers? To be brief, may we not give three?

First: the Ritualistic barrier. I regard this as the chief hindrance to real unity. It is well known. Even a cursory glance through the official pages of the verbatim account of the Prayer Book Measure discussions in Parliament will prove to the hilt the reality of this vital matter. Surely it is clear that the Ritualists and Romanizers are the Dissenters. Yet they enjoy their privileges within the Establishment, while our Free Churchmen bravely endure the lack of those privileges outside.

Second: Financial. This barrier is perhaps of lesser importance than No. 1, but it is as real and is, I think, enormously hard to break down. On the one hand, there are the endowments which are in use—Ecclesiastical Commission monies and possessions, Queen Anne's Bounty, etc. On the other hand, there are the properties of the various Free Church communions.

Is it not crystal clear that any attempt to unite either or all of the Christian Churches must come up against this terrific obstacle? Would it not involve sacrifice of a major dimension? How many good ministers would be hit, and even brought to the verge of extinction if the emoluments were even temporarily withdrawn?

Yet, by the grace of God, could not something drastic be accomplished?

Third. Certain pet theories, and minor differences have a way of dividing forces which should and could be united. This is almost as vital as either of the other barriers, and is more dangerous because of its pettiness. To give an instance of what I mean, let me tell of a case of two men—both keen evangelicals. They are working in the same institution as ministers and preachers. One is a Free and the other is a State Churchman. Suffice it to say that there are obvious clashes and much overlapping. Both are quite friendly, but somehow there is the barrier.

2. Personal witness:

First: I love the old Church of England. I owe much to her. Baptized—taught—regularly received in worship and service—my heart is with her as my spiritual home. Yet, I owe, I believe, as much to the Free Churches. Strange? It is true. As far as I am mentally equipped for the ministry, I have received far more from my association with the Free Churches than from any other source. I may affirm that I have never heard and have never read a sermon by any vicar or curate that could be compared with some Free Church sermons. C. H. Spurgeon, Joseph Parker, R. F. Horton, and a number of others have drawn me to their churches from time to time and to them and men like them, personally I owe a debt that can never be discharged.

It is plain that there is an enormous power house 'over the way.' Can a 'bridge' be constructed to bring us together?

My mind is unequal to the job of even suggesting anything. While I magnify my office, I am utterly unable to do more than set up a query. But it is my fervent hope that brains and hearts will get to work to gather the materials for and eventually to construct that 'bridge.'

WILLIAM J. JOBLING.

The Rectory, Farleigh, Surrey.

Entre Nous.

'Beyond Personality.' [1]

This is the title of Mr. C. S. Lewis's new book which reproduces, with additions, his most recent broadcasts. Mr. Lewis is one of the most suggestive and most illuminating of contemporary apologists; and when he tackles, as he does here, the Christian idea of God we expect, and receive, both entertainment and instruction.

[1] Published by Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press; 2s. 6d. net.

Do we want Theology?

At the outset he meets the plea for a 'simple practical religion,' without dogmas and formulas, and with his genius for illustration he replies to it effectively. When a man sees the Atlantic and then looks at a map of it, he turns from something real to something less real. But there are two things to remember about the map. It is based on what hundreds and thousands of people have found by sailing the real Atlantic. It has masses

of experience behind it. And, secondly, if you want to go anywhere, the map is absolutely necessary. Well, theology is like the map. Doctrines aren't God; they are only a kind of map. But the map is based on the experience of hundreds of thousands of people who were really in touch with God. And further, if you want to go anywhere, to work out your experience, you need the map. You don't get eternal life by feeling the presence of God in flowers or music or by getting good advice. If Christianity only means one more bit of good advice, then it is of no importance.

Beyond Personality.

A good many people nowadays say: 'I believe in a God, but not a personal God.' They feel that the mysterious something which is behind all other things must be more than a person. Now, the Christians quite agree, says Mr. Lewis. But the Christians are the only people who offer any idea of what a being that is beyond personality could be like. All the other people, though they say that God is *beyond* personality, really think of Him as something impersonal: that is, as something *less* than personal. If you are looking for something super-personal, something *more* than a person, then it isn't a question of choosing between the Christian idea and other ideas. The Christian idea is the only one on the market.

Prayer and God.

Mr. Lewis insists that theology is practical, and he takes prayer as an example. An ordinary simple Christian kneels down to say his prayers. He is trying to get into touch with God. But if he is a Christian he knows that what is prompting him to pray is also God: God, so to speak, inside him. But he also knows that all his real knowledge of God comes through Christ—that Christ is standing beside him, helping him to pray, praying for him. You see what is happening. God is the thing beyond the whole universe *to* which he is praying—the goal he is trying to reach. God is also the thing inside him which is pushing him on. God is also the road or bridge along which he is being pushed. So that the whole threefold life of the three-personal Being is actually going on in that ordinary little bedroom where an ordinary man is saying his prayers.

The Only-begotten.

You must not imagine that this little book is all simple popular stuff. All the way through it there is definite hard thinking. It is 'popular' in the sense of being clear and at every point illuminated by illustrations that are really helpful. Mr. Lewis never forgets his audience, but he is never afraid to make them think. And he does not shrink from dealing with the inner life of the three-personal God. He makes the distinction between begetting and making. The Son was begotten, not made. When we beget we produce something like ourselves; when we make we produce something different. And the Son is the self-expression of the Father.

But even so, that looks as if the Son came after the Father. How is that difficulty met? Well, no doubt it can be met philosophically by the suggestion of a timeless being and a timeless state in which there is no before and after. But Mr. Lewis meets it by an illustration. If you imagine a certain picture, the act of imagining is the cause and the mental picture the result. But that does not mean that you first did the imagining and *then* got the picture. The moment you did it, the picture was there. The picture was the expression of the imaginative act but was, so to speak, part of the same process, simultaneous as well as result. If this had been the act of a Being in Eternity, the picture would be as eternal as the act.

These are a few of the passages in this delightful book which linger in the memory. It is a really helpful book, and written with such vitality that it constantly engages the mind with interest and pleasure.

F. J. Rae.

Four Types.

'In any congregation there are likely to be four types of hearers. First, there are the publicans and sinners; and, contrary to what is usually supposed, these are the easiest to reach. . . . Then there are the Pharisees and hypocrites; I mean those who have the form of godliness, but have never had any vital experience of contact with Christ. These are far harder to awake. But far worse than either of these are the contented Christians—those who have been converted, and have then contentedly settled down to Christian mediocrity, certain that whoever else is wrong they are right, and that the path to heaven stretches straight before their feet. . . . Of the fourth type of hearers, those who desire more because they have much, it is not necessary that I should say anything further here.' [1]

The Cross.

'Three things there are,' said one,
'That miracles are—
Dawn, and the setting sun
And a falling star.'

'Two things there be,' he said,
'Beyond man's quest:
The white peace of the dead,
And a heart at rest.'

'One only thing,' he cried,
'Draws all men still—
A stark cross standing wide
On a windy hill.' [2]

[1] S. Neill, Bishop of Tinnevelly, *The Wrath and the Peace of God.*

[2] Edgar P. Dickie, *The Obedience of a Christian Man.*

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.